

THE LIBRARY.

THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

THERE is, among the Lansdowne manuscripts at the British Museum, a folio volume of no great bulk, which, if we believe the story it tells, is perhaps the most pitiful of all monuments to the vanity of antiquarian endeavour. For it embraces, or at least purports to embrace, the entire remains of that extensive collection of the unprinted drama of the earlier seventeenth century brought together, or supposed to have been brought together, about a hundred years later by John Warburton, Somerset Herald, prefaced by a long list of the treasures that have perished. The story of that disaster is one of the best known of literary anecdotes: how the zealous antiquary laboriously gathered together this unique collection of pieces by Shakespeare and others; how he handed it over for safe custody to his cook, who made use of the precious leaves for some obscure process connected with her trade, and how the owner made no further inquiry on the subject till he had devoured all but three and a half out of a total of some fifty or sixty plays. The story has been told over and over again

with every kind of facetious adornment, till no history of literature is complete without it, and our national biography has to take serious account of the eccentric herald and his cook Elizabeth B.

I wish someone would tell me who invented Elizabeth B. I write of her in this perhaps unduly familiar manner because I have to confess that I do not know her name. The earliest authority on the subject that I have been able to discover is a certain Cuthbert Clutterbuck, who, in a letter dated Kennaquhair, 1 April 1822, tells how the 'Author of Waverley' found the privacy of his bedchamber invaded by a distressed female, who introduced herself as 'the spirit of . . . that unhappy Elizabeth or Betty Barnes, long cook-maid to Mr. Warburton, the painful collector, but ah! the too careless custodian, of the largest collection of ancient plays ever known.' The curious reader will find this letter printed at the beginning of Scott's 'Fortunes of Nigel,' but I fear he will find no further indication of the source of the story thus circumstantially given. The only other credible witness I have been able to discover is the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' and there, in the article on John Warburton, the name of his servant is given, not as Betty Barnes, but as Betsy Baker. Unfortunately again no authority is quoted, and I have diligently searched all the general references given at the end of the article without being able to obtain any light on the subject whatever. It only remains to point out that if the name Betsy Baker is correct, this play-burning cook was called by what has been almost a generic name

from the days of Langland to our own, and chose her parents with curiously prophetic insight.

Apart from this matter of the name the original source of the story seems to be Warburton's own memorandum appended to the list of the lost plays. Warburton was, perhaps not without cause, one of the most unpopular of men, and any joke at his expense was sure to be readily believed and widely circulated. One must be prepared for exaggerations: and, indeed, in 1891 a contributor to 'Notes and Queries' (Ser. 7, xii. 15), signing himself A. Hall, went so far as to ridicule the whole story. That any statement of the Somerset Herald should command implicit belief can, it is true, hardly be maintained; but in the present instance the information he gives is so little to his credit as an antiquary, that there is at least a strong presumption that he is telling the truth.

It will be well to give Warburton's list exactly as it stands, more particularly as none of the copies at present available are quite satisfactory. It was first printed, at a time when the manuscript was still in the possession of the first Marquis of Lansdowne, by Reed in his 'Variorum' Shakespeare of 1803 (ii. 371-2). The whole of his account, however, is very careless, and several titles are altogether omitted from the list. A much more accurate copy was contributed over the initials of J. Haslewood to Bridges' 'Censura Literaria' in 1807 (v. 273). After censuring both Reed and 'the second part of the Catalogue of the Lansdowne MSS.' for errors, he adds some interesting observations of his own. 'The writing,'

he says of the list, 'is in a very different hand from his [Warburton's], and did not the "many years collecting" imply their being obtained at various times, I should have supposed had been an index to them, made sixty years or more before his memorandum was written. The orthography is certainly of an earlier period than the strange diction of Warburton, which is not that of old spelling, but of false spelling.' He further appends extracts from the catalogue of Warburton's sale in Nov. 1759,¹ including, besides the Lansdowne volume, 'The Tyrant, a Tragedy. 4to,' which appears in the list, and 'Demetrius and Marina, or the Imperial Impostor and Unhappy Heroine, a Tragedy. Fol.,' which does not.

The Lansdowne Catalogue mentioned by Haslewood is the sale catalogue of April 1807,² and when he speaks of 'the Lansdowne MSS. No. 849,' he is referring to the number of the lot. This has caused some confusion, since of course by 'the second part of the Catalogue of the Lansdowne MSS.' one now understands the second volume of the Catalogue made after the collection had found a home in the British Museum, and published in 1819, in which the manuscript is numbered 807. The sale catalogue prints Warburton's list entire, and far more accurately than Reed. Haslewood indeed corrects some further errors (though in the

¹ I have been unable to find a copy of this.

² The sale, of course, never took place, the nation acquiring the collection *en bloc* for £4,925. I presume that the sale was first postponed pending negotiations, for the money was not paid till the October following.

particular point which he cites as evidence of inaccuracy in the Catalogue he is wrong) but he follows both his predecessors in the serious mistake of printing Warburton's memorandum at the end of the whole list, instead of at the end of the first page only.

In Sept. 1815, Frederick Thornhill reprinted Reed's list in the 'Gentleman's Magazine' (p. lxxxv. 217-22 and 424), with comments of his own, and corrections from a private transcript with which he had been favoured; but though this correspondent of the great Silvanus Urban had 'been informed' that the original document was now safely lodged at the British Museum, he apparently did not see the desirability of consulting it himself, and so robbed his communication of much of the value it might otherwise have possessed. In 1819 appeared the second part of the big British Museum Catalogue of Lansdowne Manuscripts, in which the list is printed with commendable though not quite consistent care, but in which Warburton's note is again misplaced. The list given by Fleay in his 'Life of Shakespeare' (1888) is less accurate than a comparison of accessible copies might have made it, even without recourse to the original.'

¹ Gifford, in the introduction to his edition of 'Massinger' in 1805, recounts the usual tale, and ends by giving the titles of the three survivors as mentioned by Reed. He adds: 'These, it is said, are now in the library of the marquis of Lansdowne, where they will, probably, remain in safety till moths, or damp, or fires mingle their "forgotten dust" with that of their late companions.' For this piece of impertinence he was not undeservedly rebuked by his reviewers, to whom he retorted in the preface to his second edition in 1813 with more spirit than discretion. Nevertheless in that edition the offending passage still stands, despite the fact that the manuscripts in question had in the interval passed into public custody!

230 THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

The volume, as I have said, is now numbered 807 of the Lansdowne Manuscripts. It is a thin foolscap folio bound in russia. The end papers are modern. An original flyleaf is preserved, but not numbered; then comes a leaf with the Warburton and Shelburne book-plates on the verso, then Warburton's list, mounted and reckoned as folio 1. The plays follow: the 'Queen of Corinth' occupying folios 2-28, the 'Second Maiden's Tragedy' folios 29-56, the 'Bugbears' folios 57-77. At the end is an imperfect play in quarto occupying folios 78-88. It is a fragment of the 'Benefice' by R. Wild containing III. iv. to the end. That completes the collection as now extant. Here is the description of it as it is alleged to have once existed:

Manuscripts

[*recto*]

The Hon^r. Loves by Will. Rowley¹

Henry y^e 1st. by Will. Shakespear & Rob. Davenport

The fair favourit

Minervas Sacrifice Phill. Massenger

Duke Humphery Will. Shakespear

Citty Shuffler

S^r. Joⁿ. Suckling's Workes

Nothing Imposable to love T. C. S^r Rob. le Green

The forc'd Lady A T. Phill. Massinger

The Governer T. S^r. Corñ. Fermido

The Lovers of Loodgate

The Flying Voice by Ra. Wood

¹ The second word has been variously read as 'Hon^r,' i.e. honourable, or 'Hon^d,' i.e. honoured. The superior letter resembles a 'd,' but a comparison with other cases shows that 'r' is certainly intended.

The Mayden Holaday by Chriſ. Marlowe
 The Fatal Love
 The Puritan Maid y^e. Modest Wife & y^e. Wanton Widow
 by Tho. Middleton
 The London Marchat (sic) A Com. by Joⁿ Ford.
 The King of Swedland
 Love hath found out his Eyes by Tho. Jorden
 Antonio & Vallia by Phill. Massinger
 The Dutches of Fernandina T. Hen. Glapthorn
 Jocondo & Astolfo C. Thō. Decker
 S^t. Geō. for England by Will. Smithe
 The Parliam^t of Love by W^m. Rowley
 The Widows Priſe C. W^m Sampson
 The Inconstant Lady W^m. (sic) Wilson
 The Womans Plott Phill. Massinger
 The [Marchants Sacrifice] Crafty Marchat (sic) C Shack.
 Marmio[n]¹
 An Interlude by Ra. Wood worth Nothing ^E
 The Tyrant A Tragedy by Phill. Massenger
 [The Yorkshire Gentlewoman & her Son T.]²
 The None Such A C. W^m. Rowley
 The Royal Combate A C. by Joⁿ. Forde.
 Philenzo & Hipolito A C. by Phill. Massenger
 Beauty in a Trance A C. Joⁿ. Forde.
 The Judge A C. by Phill. Massenger.
 A good beginning may have A good end by Joⁿ. Ford
 Fast and Welcome C. by Phill. Massinger³
 Belive as yoⁿ. list C. by Phill. Massinger
 His^t. of Jobe by Rob. Green
 The Vestall A Tragedy by H. Glapthorn
 The Noble Tryall. T. H. Glapthorn

¹ The title first written has been crossed out: the name is crowded in and the end is no longer visible.

² This entry is crossed out.

³ The 'C.' standing for Comedy, is interlined.

After I had been many years Collecting
these MSS Playes, through my own
carelesness and the Ignorance (sic) of my S[er]¹
in whose hands I had lodgd them they
was unluckely burnd or put under
Pye bottoms, excepting y^e three which followes.

J. W.

Manuscripts

[*verso*]

Yorkshire Gentlewoman and her Son T
The Hon^r. of Women A C. by Massinger
Alexias or y^e chast Glallant (sic) T. P Massinger
The vestal a Tragedy H. Glapthorn²
The Noble choise T.C. P. Massinger
A Mask R. Govell
2^d. p^t. Maidens Trag^e. Geo. Chapman
The Great Man T.
The Spanish Purchas C.
The Queen of Corsica T. by F. Jaques
The Trag^d. of Jobe Good
The Nobleman T.C. Cyrill Turñuer
A Play by Will Shakespear
Bugbear C. Joⁿ. Geffrey
Orpheus C.
Tis Good Sleeping in A Whole Skin W. Wager
Farry (sic) Queen³

There was a time when I entertained serious
doubts as to the genuineness of a material part or

¹The catalogue gives the letters 'Ser,' but only the first is now
clearly legible. The edge is frayed, but there can never have been
room for the full word.

²The 'H.' has been altered.

³The second 'r' of 'Farry' has been altered, but there does
not seem any doubt as to the reading.

Warburton's alleged memorandum, for I could not find it in the manuscript itself. The volume in question has been repaired at some comparatively recent date, and a list of plays mounted on a guard. Now if the slip on which the list of supposed manuscripts is written be carefully examined, it will be observed that the end of the memorandum as printed above is wanting, and there are indications that suggest, what is indeed the case, that the slip can never have contained more writing than now appears. It was, therefore, very difficult to account for the entry in the catalogue. One day, however, I observed that at some period the slip had been fastened down to the original flyleaf by means of wafers. This fact, which I might indeed have learned from the Catalogue or from Haslewood, gave the clue to the mystery. For on a closer inspection I discovered that Warburton's writing had run off the slip on to the leaf to which it was attached, and there the end of the memorandum, though very faint, may still be traced. A careless binder had almost destroyed the evidence of the nefarious Betsy's crime!

So far then the document bears examination. I should further say that after comparing several letters of Warburton's written between 1750 and 1760 preserved in the British Museum, I see no reason to question the authenticity of the note, nor, in spite of obvious differences in the writing, to deny that the list itself may likewise be in his handwriting. To the point raised by Haslewood as to the archaic spelling of the list there is an obvious reply—namely, that the titles are of course

copies; and I would call attention to one small point in favour of their having been written by Warburton. For in the note he has accidentally left out the second 'n' in 'Ignorance,' while in the list we twice find 'Marchat' for 'Marchant.' There remain, however, plenty of difficulties in connection with this list. It is written on the two sides of a long narrow slip of paper. At the head of each page is the word 'Manuscripts,' but the list fills neither page. On the recto, however, the titles came down to within a few inches of the foot, leaving only a small space in which the note has been subsequently inserted. On the verso they fill less than half the page. The presence of the note has been taken to imply that the list must have been written out from memory. This may, I think, be at once dismissed as improbable. A man so little careful of his manuscripts as to leave them long unsought in the care of his servant, could never have sat down and written out a list of fifty or sixty titles and authors from memory. Moreover, the note is written in a different style and ink from the list, even supposing the hand to be the same. We shall, therefore, be justified in assuming that the list was among the papers rescued, and that it consequently dates from many years before the note. It may, in that case, have been compiled from the actual manuscripts enumerated, though there is nothing to prove that it was. It should be noticed that it is not quite clear whether the memorandum is intended to apply to the plays on both sides of the paper, or only to the list at the foot of which it stands. Nor does it appear

what the relation of the two lists is. Is that on the verso a mere continuation of the other? If so, why was the verso used when there was still room on the recto? Moreover, the 'Vestal' appears in both lists, and so does the 'Yorkshire Gentlewoman,' though this is struck out again on the recto. The 'History' and the 'Tragedy of Job' are also very likely the same. Are these mere oversights? After it had lain hid for many years did Warburton himself remember accurately the significance of the list? That he owned some of the plays in it we know, that others perished seems likely, but was there really the wholesale slaughter that the collector in his disappointment would have us believe? This is a question that probably can never be answered for certain, but it may be that a closer examination will at least suggest a possible solution. The investigation will take us rather far afield, but I hope that it may repay us for our wanderings by the light incidentally thrown on the bibliography of the seventeenth century drama in general.

The dislocation of our knowledge of the English book trade that occurs about the year 1640 is eloquent of the debt we owe to Professor Arber for his transcript of the Stationers' Register, but is not in itself a good thing, and it is with keen anticipation that many students look forward to the now promised continuation of that great work. Our present ignorance is rather specially unfortunate in the case of the drama, since not only do the entries of individual plays continue, but there also

occur from time to time entries of whole batches of plays, mostly old ones, evidently made with a view to extensive publishing ventures consequent upon the closing of the theatres during the Civil War and under the Commonwealth. These entries, though neglected by recent critics, were utilized by some of the earlier biographers of the English stage, and many references will be found in the 'Biographia Dramatica' of 1812. From these scattered notes Fleay reconstructed the entries of 1653 and 1660 in his 'Life of Shakespeare' (1880), and these lists, though inaccurate, have up to the present been by far the best at the disposal of students. They possess additional value through being printed in parallel columns with that of Warburton's alleged collection.

I propose in this place to print in full some of the chief play-entries from the later volumes of the Stationers' Register. Of these the above-mentioned entries of 1653 and 1660 form perhaps the most important, for the reason that they were largely inoperative, and therefore preserve for us the titles of many plays which are not now discoverable. The real nature of the entry belonging to 1646 does not seem to have been previously recorded, and I have on my conscience a statement to the effect that the publishers of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of the following year dispensed with the formality of entry. This is now seen to be incorrect. Fleay, however, only mentions four plays under this date, and it was a remark by the anonymous editor of Wilson's 'Inconstant Lady,' printed in 1814, to the effect

THE BAKINGS OF BETSY. 237

that the entry contained forty-eight plays, that first long ago suggested further search. By a lucky chance my friend Mr. Plomer happened at the time to be consulting the later Registers for other purposes, and kindly undertook to transcribe for me the entries now printed here.¹

A.

4°. Sept. [1646] . . .

Liber E,

p. 53.

Entred for their Copies vnder the hands of m^r Langley & m^r whitaker warden these Seu'all Tragedies & Comedies herevnder mençoned (viz^t.) [(Saluo iure cuiuscumq.)]² Mr. Robin-son & Mr. Mozely.

xxiiij^a.

*Mad Lover
Wild goose chase
Litle french Lawyer
Loyall Subiect
Spanish Curate
Custome of y^e Country
Double Marriage
wife for a Month
Island Princes
Pilgrime *The Lawes of Candy
Womans prize or the Tamer tam'd
Knights of Malta
The Captaine
The Noble Enemie or the humerous
Leiftenant
*The Woemen pleased
Bonducca or Boadicea
[Mounsieur Perrollis]¹ *mistaken
Chaunces

by m^r Beamont
&
m^r Flesher

¹ In the 1646 entry there are certain additions in a different hand. These are distinguished by an asterisk prefixed.

² These words in brackets are crossed out in the original.

238 THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

*The Sea Voyage
 Maid of the Mill
 Queene of Corinth
 Coxecombe
 Noble gentleman
 Beggars Bush
 Honest mans fortune
 Martiall Maid
 The Emperor Valentinian
 The Prophetesse
 The Lovers pilgrimage
 The Lovers progresse

	Love & honor	} by Sr W ^m . Davenant	} By Sr. W ^m . Davenant
	Distresses		
	Fair Favourite		
p. 54. Mr. Robin- son & Mr. Mozeley.	Newes from Plymouth	} by my Lord of Newcastle	
	Country Captaine		
	Varieties	} by M ^r Shirley	
	Doubtfull heire		
	Imposture		
	Brothers		
	Cardinall		
	The Sisters		
	Maior of Quinborough		
	The passionate Lover	* 1 st . & 2 ^d . parts	
	Spartan Ladies	} by M ^r Carlile	
	Switzer	} by M ^r Wilson	
	The Corporal		
	The princes	by M ^r Killebrew	
	The fatall friendship	by m ^r Burroughes	

A few notes may serve to make the bearing of these entries clear. The first thirty plays will at once be recognised as constituting the entry for the folio of 'Comedies and Tragedies Written by

Francis Beaumont And John Fletcher Gentlemen. Never printed before, And now published by the Authors Originall Copies' printed for Robinson & Moseley in 1647. That volume, however, if we include in it the *Wild Goose Chase*, published as a supplement in 1652 and entered second on the above list, contained thirty-six pieces, none of which had been previously entered or printed. The omission of six plays does not appear to have been discovered at the time, but, as will be seen from a subsequent list (C), the missing titles were duly entered to the same stationers on 29 June 1660, perhaps in anticipation of the new and enlarged edition, which, however, did not appear till 1679, and was then published by Martyn, Herringman and Marriot. The alternative title of the 'Humorous Lieutenant' looks as though there had been more than one MS., for no trace of the 'Noble Enemy' is found in the folio text. I am unable to guess what 'Mounsieur Perrollis' can be.

Of Davenant's plays, 'Love and Honour' was printed in 1649, while the other three first appeared in the folio published by Herringman in 1673. The five plays by Shirley were published, together with the 'Court Secret', in the 'Six New Plays' of 1653. The 'Mayor of Quinboro' first appeared, published by Herringman, in 1661, with a title-page ascribing it to Middleton. The two parts of Carrell's 'Passionate Lovers' were printed in 1655, but the 'Spartan Ladies' is not known, though it was advertised by Moseley along with the 'Discrete Lover' and 'Osman' among 'Books I do purpose to Print very speedly (sic)' in a

catalogue found at the end of some copies of Middleton's 'Two New Plays' of 1657.¹ Wilson's 'Switzer' is extant in manuscript (BM. Add. 36759), and has been edited by Professor Feuillerat; while of the 'Corporal' unfortunately nothing but a list of dramatis personae remains (Bodl. MS. Rawl. Poet. 9). The 'Princess,' by Thomas Killigrew, was included in the collected folio of his plays published by Herringman in 1664. Neither of the 'Fatal Friendship' nor of Mr. Burroughes does anything further appear to be known. A tragedy bearing the same title was later written by Catherine Trotter and printed in 1698.

B.

Liber E.

p. 285.

September. y^e. 9th: 1653. . . .

m^r. Mosely. Entred also for his Copies the severall Playes following.
xx[j]^e. vj^d.²

¹ As pointed out by Baker ('Comp. to the Playhouse,' 1764). The only copy that I have seen which has the catalogue is that at Trinity College, Cambridge. The catalogue is in two quires, a³ b². Later the two leaves of b were cancelled, and a full sheet, B³, appended to the remaining copies of a. I have a copy of the catalogue in this form at the end of Massinger's 'Three New Plays' of 1655. In this among the 'Books lately Printed' appear Carlell's 'Discrete Lover' and 'Osmond.' The 'Spartan Ladies' has vanished, but its place is taken by the 'Deserving Favourite.' This was an old play printed as early as 1629, of which Mosely issued an edition in 1659. I suspect that the 'Spartan Ladies' was the title borne by another manuscript of this play. The name would be appropriate enough to the ladies who resolve to die with their lover and brother, while there are points which would even make Sparta not unsuitable as the scene of the action.

² It should be noticed that the sum has been altered from 21s. 6d. to 20s. 6d. This brings it right for forty-one plays. 'Henry I & Henry II' is counted as one piece.

THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

241

- The Widdowes Prize. by M^r. W^m. Samson
Witt in Madnesse
The Louesick Maid, or the honour } Rich: Brome.
of Young Ladies. by
The Discreet Louer, or The Foole }
would bee a Fauourite. by } Lod: Carlel.
Osman, the Great Turke, or
The Noble seruant. both by
The Countrey man.
The Siege. by W^m: Dauenant
The Iew of Venice, by Tho: Decker.
The Woman's mistaken. by. Drew, & Dauenport.
The History of Cardennio, by M^r. Fletcher. & Shake-
speare.
The Gouvernour. by S^r. Cornelius Formido.
The Kings Mistresse
Beauty in a Trance. by M^r. In^o. Ford.
More Dissemblers besides Women. }
A right Woman, or Women } M^r. Tho:
beware of Women. } Midleton.
No Witt, no helpe like a Woman
The Puritan Maid, modest Wife
& Wanton Widdow. by.
The Noble Choice, or y^e Orato^r
The Wandring Louers, or y^e Painter
The Italian Night peece, or {
The Vnfortunate, Piety {
Alexius the Chast Gallant or. }
The Bashfull Lover. }
A very Woman, or y^e Womans Plot. } By Phill:
The Iudge, or Belciue, as yoⁿ list } Massinger.
The Prisoner, or y^e Faire Anchoress
The Citie honest man, or y^e Guardian
The Spanish Vice Roy, or y^e Hono^r: of
Women.
Minerva's Sacrifice, or y^e Forc'd Lady }

p. 286.
more to
M^r. Mosely

242 THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

The Maid's Tragedie. 2^d. part
 The Crafty Merchant. or the } by Shakerly Marmion.
 Souldred Citizen }
 The Politique Bankrupt, or }
 which is y^e. Best Girle. }
 The Foole without Booke. } by W^m:
 A Knaue in Print, or One for another. } Rowley.
 The Polititian, by James Shirley.
 The spanish Duke of Lerma. }
 The Duke of Guize } by Henry Shirley.
 The Dumbe Bawde & }
 Giraldo, y^e Constant Lover }
 The merry Deuill of Edmonton. by W^m: Shakespeare.
 Henry y^e. first, & Hen: y^e 2^d. by Shakespeare, &
 Dauenport.
 The Nobleman, or Great man. by Cyrill Tourneur.
 The Inconstant Lady by M^r. Arth. Wilson.

C.

[29 Iune 1660.]

Liber F.
 p. 193.

M^r. Hum: Entred for their Copies (under the hand of M^r Thrale
 Robinson Warden) these severall Plays following. vizt

M ^r . Hum:	The false one.	} iij s
& M ^r . Hum:	The Nice Valour or the passionate Madman.	
Moseley.	Witt at severall Weapons.	
	The Faire Maid of the Inne.	
	A Maske of the Gentlemen of Graies Inne and the Inner Temple at y ^e marriage of the Prince and Princesse Palatine of the Rhene.	
	Foure Plays or morall Representations in one. all Six Copies written by Fra: Beamont & Iohn Fletcher.	

D.

The 29th of Iune 1660.

Liber F.
p. 196.
M^r. Hum:
Moseley.

Entred for his Copies (vnder the hand of M^r Thrale Warden) the severall Plays following. That is to say

The Faithfull Friend a Comedy. } by Francis Beaumont
A right Woman. a Comedy. } & Iohn Fletcher
The History of Madon King of Brittain by F: Beaumont.

The Womans Plott. a Comedy.

The Prisoners. a Tragi Comedy.

The Honour of Women. a Comedy.

Beleive as you list. a Tragedy

The forced Lady. a Tragedy.

The Tyrant. a Tragedy.

The Bashfull Lovers.

The Gardian.

Philenzo & Hypollita. a Tragi Comedy.

Antonio & Vallia. a Comedy.

Fast & Welcome. a Comedy.

The History of King Stephen.

Duke Humphrey. a Tragedy.

Iphis & Iantha Or a marriage

without a man. a Comedy.

The Vestall. a Tragedy.

The noble Triall. a Tragi Comedy.

The Dutchess of Fernandina

a Tragedy.

The Sodered Citizen. a Comedy. by Shakerley Marmion.

The Fatall Love. a French Tragedy.

A Tragedy of a Yorkshire

Gentlewoman and her sonne

The Royall Combate. a Comedy.

An ill beginning has a good end, & a bad

beginning may have a good end. a Comedy

The London Merchant. a Comedy.

} by Phillip
Massinger.

} by Will: Shakspeare.

} by Hen: Glap-
thorne.

} By Geo: Chap-
man.

} by Iohn
Forde.

(This page is bracketed and summed 'xiiij s.')

p. 197.

The 29th of Iune 1660.

Mr. Hum: Entred for his Copies (vnder y^e hand of Mr Thrale
Moseley. Warden) the severall Plays following. That is to say

The None such. a Comedy.	}	by Wittm Rowley.
The booke of y ^e 4. Hon ^{ble} . Loves. a Comedy.		
The Parliament of Love.	}	by Tho: Decker.
Gustavus King of Swethland.		
The Tale of Ioconda and } Astolso. a Comedy.		
The fatall Brothers. a Tragedy.	}	by Rob ^t . Daven- port
The Politick Queen. Or murther will out.		
Nothing impossible to Love. a Tragi Comedy by S ^r Rob ^t . Le Greece		
The Prodigall Scholar. a Comedy. by Tho: Randall.		
The Christmas Ordinary. a Comedy by Trinity Cott. Oxford		
Love hath found his Eyes. by Thomas Jordan.		

(This page is bracketed and summed 'v^s. vj^d.')

It will, of course, be noticed that there are a number of titles common to the lists of 1653 and 1660, and we cannot do better than, with the full copies of Moseley's entries and Warburton's catalogue before us, to reconstruct the parallel table given by Fleay. The entry of the six plays by Beaumont and Fletcher has already been mentioned above, and need not occupy us further.

Nine plays are common to the two entries, and of these six occur in Warburton's list:

	1653		1660		WARBURTON	
1. Alexia the Chaste Gallant, or the Bashful Lover.	Masing.		The Bashful Lover.	Masing.	Alexia or the Chaste Gallant.	Masing.
2. A Very Woman, or the Woman's Plot.	Masing.		The Woman's Plot.	Masing.	The Woman's Plot.	Masing.
3. The Judge, or Believe as you list.	Masing.		Believe as you list.	T. Masing.	{ Believe as you list. C. The Judge. C.	{ Masing. Masing.
4. The Spanish Viceroy, or the Honour of Women.	Masing.		The Honour of Women.	{ Masing.	The Honour of Women.	{ Masing.
5. Minerva's Sacrifice, or the Forced Lady.	Masing.		The Forced Lady.	T. Masing.	{ Minerva's Sacrifice. The Forced Lady. T.	{ Masing. Masing.
6. The Crafty Merchant, or the Soldered Citizen.	Marmion.		The Soldered Citizen.	{ Marmion.	The Crafty Merchant.	Marmion.
7. A right Woman, or Women beware Women.	Middleton.		A right Woman.	C. B. & F.		
8. The Prisoner, or the Fair Anchore.	Masing.		The Prisoner.	T-C. Masing.		
9. The City Honest Man, or the Guardian.	Masing.		The Guardian.	Masing.		

Nine titles are common to the 1653 entry and Warburton's list:

1653.			WARBURTON.
10.	The Widow's Prize.	Samson.	The Widow's Prize. C. Sampson.
11.	The Governor.	Formido.	The Governor. T. Formido.
12.	Beauty in a Trance.	Formido.	Beauty in a Trance. C. Formido.
13.	The Puritan Maid, Modest Wife and Wanton Widow.	Middleton.	The Puritan Maid, the Modest Wife, and the Wanton Widow. } Middleton.
14.	The Noble Choice, or the Orator.	Masinger.	The Noble Choice. T-C. Masinger.
15.	The Maid's Tragedy, and Part.	Chapman.	Second Part Maiden's Tragedy. Chapman.
16.	Henry I and Henry II.	Shakespeare & Davenport.	Henry I. Shakespeare & Davenport.
17.	The Inconstant Lady.	A. Wilson.	The Inconstant Lady. W. Wilson.
18.	The Nobleman, or Great Man.	Tourneur.	The Nobleman. T-C. Tourneur.
			The Great Man. T.

Twenty titles are common to the 1660 entry and Warburton's list:

1660.		
19.	The Tyrant. T.	Masinger.
20.	Philenzo and Hippollita. T-C.	Masinger.
21.	Antonio and Vallia. C.	Masinger.
22.	Fast and Welcome. C.	Masinger.
23.	Duke Humphrey. T.	Shakespeare.
24.	The Vestal. T.	Glaphorne.
25.	The Noble Trial. T-C.	Glaphorne.
26.	The Duchess of Fernandina. T.	Glaphorne.
27.	The Fatal Love. T.	Chapman.
28.	A Yorkshire Gentlewoman & her Son. T.	Chapman.

- | | | | |
|--|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 29. The Royal Combat. C. | Ford. | The Royal Combat. C. | Ford. |
| 30. An ill beginning has a good end, & a bad beginning may have a good end. C. | Ford. | A good beginning may have a good end. | Ford. |
| 31. The London Merchant. C. | Ford. | The London Merchant. C. | Ford. |
| 32. The Nonesuch. C. | Rowley. | The Nonesuch. C. | Rowley. |
| 33. The Four Honourable Loves. C. | Rowley. | The Honourable Loves. | Rowley. |
| 34. The Parliament of Love. | Dekker. | The Parliament of Love. | Rowley. |
| 35. Gustavus, King of Swethland. | Dekker. | The King of Swedland. | Dekker. |
| 36. Jocondo & Astolfo. C. | Le Greece. | Jocondo & Astolfo. C. | le Green. |
| 37. Nothing impossible to Love. T-C. | Jordan. | Nothing impossible to Love. T-C. | Jordan. |
| 38. Love hath found his Eyes. | | Love hath found out his Eyes. | |

Twenty-three titles occur in the 1653 entry only:

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------|
| 39. Wit in Madness. | Brome. | 50. No Wit, no Help like a Woman. | Middleton. |
| 40. Love-sick Maid, or the honour of Young Ladies. | Brome. | 51. The Wandering Lovers, or the Painter. | Masinger. |
| 41. The Discrete Lover, or the Fool would be a Favourite. | Carlell. | 52. The Italian Night Piece, or the Unfortunate Piety. | Masinger. |
| 42. Osman the Great Turk, or the Noble Servant. | Carlell. | 53. The Politic Bankrupt, or Which is the best Girl. | |
| 43. The Country Man. | Davenant. | 54. The Fool without Book. | Rowley. |
| 44. The Siege. | Dekker. | 55. A Knave in Print, or One for Another. | Rowley. |
| 45. The Jew of Venice. | Drue & Davenport. | 56. The Polititian. | J. Shirley. |
| 46. The Woman's Mistaken. | | 57. The Spanish Duke of Lerma. | H. Shirley. |
| 47. The History of Cardenio. Fletcher & Shakespeare. | | 58. The Duke of Guise. | H. Shirley. |
| 48. The King's Mistress. | | 59. The Dumb Bawd. | H. Shirley. |
| 49. More Dissemblers besides Women. | Middleton. | 60. Giraldo, the Constant Lover. | H. Shirley. |
| | | 61. The Merry Devil of Edmonton. | Shakespeare. |

Eight titles occur in the 1660 entry only:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 62. The Faithful Friend. C. Beaumont & Fletcher. | |
| 63. The History of Madan, King of Brittain. | 66. The Fatal Brothers. T. Davenport. |
| 64. The History of King Stephen. Shakespeare. | 67. The Politic Queen, or Murder will out. } Davenport. |
| 65. Iphis & Iantha, or a Marriage without a Man. } Shakespeare. | 68. The Prodigal Scholar. C. Randall. |
| | 69. The Christmas Ordinary. C. Trin. Coll. Oxon. |

Lastly, there are eighteen items which appear in Warburton's list alone

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 70. The Bugbears. C. | 79. 'Tis good sleeping in a whole skin. W. Wager. |
| 71. A mask. | 80. An interlude. R. Wood. |
| 72. The History of Job. | 81. The Flying Voice. R. Wood. |
| 73. Tragedy of Job. | 82. The City Shuffler. |
| 74. The Queen of Corsica. T. | 83. The Fair Favourite. |
| 75. The Maiden's Holiday. | 84. The Fairy Queen. |
| 76. A play. | 85. The Lovers of Ludgate. |
| 77. St. George for England. | 86. Orpheus. C. |
| 78. Works. | 87. The Spanish Purchas. |

Many of these pieces are not otherwise known: this is the case with nos. 12, 13, 22-9, 32, 35, 36, 38, 43, 46, 48, 53-5, 57-60, 62, 64-8, 72, 78, 80-2, 85, 86, 88. Concerning the rest brief notes may be desirable. I have mainly followed the references given by Fleay.

1. The 'Bashful Lover' was licensed by Herbert 9 May 1636, and printed in 1655 together with nos. 2 and 9. 'Alexius, or the Chaste Lover,' was licensed 25 Sept. 1639. There is extant in the Bodleian (MS. Donce 171, fol. 48^b) a fragment of an English comedy on the loves of Alice and Alexis. It is described as the author's draft, extending as far as III. i, but with an argument of the whole, and as belonging to the early seventeenth century. I have not seen it. Alexis was, of course, a very common name in fiction.

2. 'A Very Woman' was licensed 6 June 1634, and printed as above. The 'Woman's Plot' was acted at Court in 1621 (a statement, however, for which there seems no better authority than Reed, 'Biog. Dram.' 1782).

3. The 'Judge' was licensed 6 June 1627. 'Believe as you list' was licensed 7 May 1631, apparently as reformed from an earlier piece to which licence had on political grounds been refused on 11 Jan., and the manuscript is preserved (B.M. Egerton 2828).

4. The 'Honour of Women' was licensed 6 May 1628. The 'Spanish Viceroy' was admitted by the King's players, 20 Dec. 1624, to have been performed by them without licence.

5. 'Minerva's Sacrifice' was licensed 3 Nov. 1629.

6. The 'Cra[fty] Merchant, or Come to my Country House,' by William Bonen, was licensed 12 Sept. 1623.

7. Printed with Middleton's name in 1657, together with no. 49.

250 THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

8. The 'Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo' was licensed 26 Jan. 1640. The 'Prisoners' was properly the title of a play by T. Killigrew printed in 1664.

9. The 'Guardian' was licensed 31 Oct. 1633, and printed with Nos. 1 and 2 as above.

10. Said on doubtful authority (Halliwell's 'Dictionary') to have been licensed 25 Jan. 1625.

11. Extant in the British Museum (Add. 10419). The manuscript, dated 1656, was purchased at the Heber sale, and bears the inscription, 'This Play formerly belonged to John Warburton, Somerset Herald.'

14. The 'Orator' was licensed 10 Jan. 1635.

15. One of the plays preserved from Warburton's collection. It bears Buc's licence dated 31 Oct. 1611.

16. Licensed as by 'Dampart,' 10 Apr. 1624 (Malone, 1794, ii. 189).

17. By Arthur Wilson: preserved in a manuscript in the Bodleian (Rawl. Poet. 9A).

18. The 'Nobleman,' by Tourneur, was entered in the Stationers' Register 15 Feb. 1612, and acted at court 23 Feb. following, and again in 1612/13.

19. This play, a manuscript in quarto, was in Warburton's sale in Nov. 1759.

20. A 'Philipo and Hippolito' was a new play of the Admiral's Men, 9 July 1594, and a 'Julio and Hyppolita' is in the German collection of 1620. A manuscript is said by Collier ('Henslowe,' xxxi) to be among the Conway papers.

21. 'Antony and Valia' was a play of the Admiral's Men in 1595. A manuscript (of the second half of the seventeenth century) with Antonio of Ragusa as a character is in the Bodleian (Rawl. Poet. 93), but the chief characters are said to be Octavio and Alessandra.

30. 'A bad beginning makes a good ending' was acted at court by the King's men in 1612/13.

31. This is the name of the play disturbed by the Citizen in the 'Knight of the Burning Pestle.'

33. 'Die 4 bestendigen Liebhabers' was a play of English origin current in Germany (Mecklenburg) c. 1660 (Herz 68).

34. Licensed as Massinger's 3 Nov. 1624: the manuscript (imperfect) is preserved (Dyce, MS. 39).

39. 'Wit in a Madness' had been previously entered, together with the 'Sparagus Garden' and the 'Antipodes,' 19 Mar. 1640.

40. Licensed in Feb. 1629, and acted at court the same year.

41-2. Printed together in 1657.

44. Printed in the folio of 1673.

45. There is extant in manuscript a German play, 'Josephus, Jude von Venedig,' which is no doubt in some way related.

47. 'Cardenna' was acted 8 June 1613, 'Cardenno' at court in 1612/13.

49. Printed in 1657 with no. 7.

50. Printed in 1657.

51. The 'Wandering Lovers' was licensed as Fletcher's, 6 Dec. 1623.

52. The 'Unfortunate Piety' was licensed 13 June 1631.

56. Printed in 1655.

61. Entered 22 Oct. 1607 and printed four times before Moseley's entry, while even the edition of 1655 was not issued by him, but by W. Gilbertson.

62. The 'Faithful Friends' is preserved in manuscript (Dyce, MS. 10).

68. Presumably Thomas Randolph is the author intended: nothing is known of the play.

69. Printed, as by 'W. R. Master of Arts,' in 1682.

70. The 'Bugbears,' one of the rescued manuscripts. At the end is the inscription, 'Iohannus (sic) Jeffere scribebat hoc,' but he may have been only the scribe, or one of them, for the manuscript is in several hands.

71. There seems to be no other mention of this writer.

252 THE BAKINGS OF BETSY.

72-3. These are presumably the same. The play was not entered in 1594 as stated by Stephen Jones ('Biog. Dram.' 1812), so that Warburton remains our sole authority. Therefore 'Rob. Green' is very likely the same as 'Sr. Rob. le Green,' i.e. Le Grys (cf. no. 37). There was a piece called 'Job's Afflictions,' written by R. Radcliffe in the first half of the sixteenth century.

74. One of the rescued plays.

75. Entered as by Marlowe and Day, 8 Apr. 1654.

76. Most likely one of the plays mentioned in the other lists: either 47, 64, or 65.

78. Suckling's 'Fragmenta Aurea' had been various times printed, but other matter was left in manuscript till the 'Last Remains' of 1659. After that there was more than one complete edition.

80-1. Of Ralph Wood nothing more seems to be known.

82. The 'City Shuffler' was acted at Salisbury Court and stayed by Herbert in Oct. 1633 (Collier, 1831, ii. 54).

83. By Davenant, licensed 17 Nov. 1638, and printed in the folio of 1673.

86. A fragment is said by Reed ('Biog. Dram.' 1782) to be in the British Museum, but I have been unable to find it.

Now anyone who studies the above lists with care will find ample food for reflection. For my own part I feel it extremely difficult to make up my mind as to whether Moseley was a knave or Warburton a liar. Each alternative is intrinsically probable, and yet there seems hardly evidence enough to substantiate both charges. Could we indeed call general evidence of character, it might not be hard to do so, but we must stick to the case before us.

It is chiefly the alternative titles in Moseley's 1653 entry that excite suspicion against him, for in several cases there is independent evidence which suggests that the alternative titles really belonged to different plays. The implication, of course, would be that Moseley was trying to smuggle through two plays for a single fee. In three cases Warburton enters, as belonging to separate plays, titles given Moseley as alternative. This, as we shall see when we come to cross-examine Warburton, is not very serious, but there is better evidence to follow. The first four plays of 1653 are each entered with double titles; and in every case each title is known separately from Herbert's accounts. Moreover in the case of several plays which are extant there is nothing to suggest the alternative title at all. The 'Very Woman' contains no woman's plot; 'Believe as you list' contains no judge; the 'Guardian' deals with the court and not the city. The 'Great Man,' too, seems a foolish second-title to the 'Nobleman.' It might be suggested that Moseley meant each as an alternative entry, leaving himself the option of publishing either play. This, however, seems very unlikely, and there is no evidence that the Stationers' Company would ever have sanctioned such a proceeding. Moreover, 'Henry I and Henry II' is clearly entered as one play, though such a title is almost incredible. In no less than nine cases plays entered under double titles in 1653 were re-entered under one title only in 1660. This almost forces us to the belief that not nine but eighteen plays were really involved, whether we suppose

that Moseley discovered his mistake and rectified it of his own accord, or that the Company discovered it and forced him to do so.

There is something to be said in Moseley's favour. The fraud supposed would have been a dangerous one to practice, for had the Company discovered it, it is unlikely that they would have been satisfied with mere re-entry. Moreover in two cases (1 and 9) the title re-entered in 1660 is that under which Moseley had himself published in play in the interval. This looks like mere blundering. A solution is perhaps suggested by the case of the 'Spanish Viceroy,' for it will be observed that there is nothing to prevent our supposing that the play acted without licence in 1624 was subsequently revised and licensed under another title in 1628. Even though we may not be inclined to follow Fleay in all his hazardous identifications, it still seems probable that a great deal of revision and re-writing did take place in the Massinger plays, and it is conceivable that this may account in part at least for the difficulties noticed. Even in the case of 'Believe as you list' it may be submitted that the political events upon which the plot was based were not recent, that a play presumably founded upon them is recorded by Henslowe as early as 1601, and that there is no gross improbability in supposing that Herbert licensed in 1627 a play substantially the same as another which he refused in January 1631, when the peace with Spain was a tender babe of a few months only. It is more than probable, therefore, that divergent versions of certain plays existed under different

titles. If then it be supposed that the manuscripts in Moseley's hands bore both titles, or that he was aware of the double nature of the plays he hoped to secure, and also that the duplicate entries of 1660 may be explained as mere oversights, it may not be impossible to account for the puzzles of the entries in the Registers. That grave difficulties do not remain, in view of the apparent irreconcilability of the alleged duplicate titles of extant pieces, cannot be contended, but I must content myself with suggesting possibilities in a case in which I have admittedly no satisfactory theory to offer my readers.

Should it have chanced that Moseley acted honestly in the matter, and that his entries are correct, it follows, of course, that the authenticity of Warburton's list must go by the board. For the close agreement between that list and the entries has been generally and necessarily held to indicate that Moseley's collection must have formed the bulk of Warburton's, and probably came into his hands *en bloc*. If then Moseley's alternative titles are genuine, how comes it that in three cases Warburton has made separate plays of them? We are at once confronted with the question: Is Warburton's list what it purports to be, a genuine catalogue of a collection of manuscript plays, or is it a fabrication from various sources? And it becomes at this point important to know whether Warburton was acquainted with the Stationers' Registers or not. There is definite evidence that he was. For one of his plays which has survived is headed the 'The Second Maiden's Tragedy.'

The heading is late, and has been borrowed from Buc's license of 31 Oct. 1611, at the end: 'This second maydens tragedy (for it hath no name inscribed) may wth the reformations bee acted publicly.' This is almost certainly the play entered as 'The Maid's Tragedie. 2^d. part,' in 1653, and there surely can be little doubt that Warburton had this entry as well as the manuscript play before him when he entered the latter in his own list as '2^d. p^t. Maidens Trag.' Warburton thus knew a source which would account for perhaps three quarters of his own list. We must therefore scrutinize his evidence somewhat closer. If his complete collection came originally from Moseley, it could hardly be, as he represents it the result of many years' collecting; it must have come *en bloc*. There is, however, the possibility that he added to it from other sources, so that this point should not be pressed. The entries of 1653 and 1660 account for thirty-eight out of a total of fifty-six items in the list, so that only eighteen remain. Two are entered under other dates. One, 'A Play by Will Shakespear,' is also probably one of those entered. One is known from Herbert's licenses. Suckling's Works imply no special knowledge. The two 'Jobs' are most likely identical. There remain twelve which we can only account for as representing actual manuscripts. Two of these manuscripts actually exist in the Lansdowne volume. As regards the ten others, it must be borne in mind that Warburton may have had a better knowledge of the Registers from 1640 onwards than we as yet can boast, and the

same may even possibly apply to the licenses of the Masters of the Revels. We are therefore by no means bound to assume that they all represent actual manuscripts. And there are certain suspicious points about the list. Of the twelve plays just mentioned, nine occur in the shorter list on the verso of the leaf, and these nine include the two out of three plays rescued complete which are not otherwise recorded: moreover, the last few entries on this side are somewhat irregular, and many have been added later. Of the last ten titles, the only one previously recorded is Tourneur's 'Nobleman,' while in the list on the recto of the leaf there are only nine items not in Moseley's entries, and of these four are known from other sources. The fragmentary play of Wild's rescued is not entered in the list at all; nor is 'Demetrius and Marina,' which appeared at Warburton's sale; but these may have been acquired later. On the other hand, the 'Tyrant,' which is represented as having been destroyed, was also in the sale, and is presumably still extant somewhere. So again with Formido's 'Governor,' which is extant in the British Museum. It may be a different manuscript, of course, but it bears a note, possibly in Heber's own hand-writing, stating that it is the same. Again, 'Believe as you list,' entered both in 1653 and 1660, is in Warburton's list of victims, yet it too is now safe in the British Museum. Here again we may suppose two manuscripts, but it will be well to remember that Moseley's collection must have consisted mostly of official playhouse copies bearing the Master's licence, that we

know that this was the case with one early play preserved—the ‘Second Maiden’s Tragedy’—and that it is just the official licensed copy of ‘Believe as you list’ that has survived. There is also a slight difficulty that arises if we suppose Moseley’s alternative titles to be genuine, and Warburton to have inherited his collection. For some of the plays had been printed, and if Moseley had sent a play to the press, it is most unlikely that he would have ever seen the copy again, still more unlikely that he would have replaced it among his unprinted stock. There is one point on which Warburton clearly had some authority independent of the Register. In the 1653 list we find ‘Alexis the Chaste Gallant,’ in Warburton’s ‘Alexias or the Chaste Gallant.’ Now ‘Alexias’ is supported by the ‘Alexius’ of Herbert’s licence, but Herbert has ‘Lover’ for ‘Gallant.’ If Herbert is correct, we have another instance in which Warburton followed the Register and not the manuscript. He may have concocted the title from the 1653 entry and either Herbert or some other source now lost. If Herbert was right! We cannot tell; but as Moseley added a second title, the ‘Bashful Lover,’ he would have had a motive for altering ‘Lover’ to ‘Gallant,’ while Herbert would have no reason for a change.

This, I think, concludes the evidence I have been able to extract from the lists. That it amounts to a disproof of Warburton’s extraordinary claim I do not for a moment pretend. But taken all together, I think that it does throw considerable doubt upon the story. My own idea of what

happened is somewhat as follows. Warburton in the course of his antiquarian researches came across a few manuscript plays and grew interested in the subject. He collected notes, probably from various sources, but chiefly from Moseley's entries, and made out a list containing the titles of such pieces as he thought it might be possible to recover, in addition to those of the plays of which he had already become possessed. Some he actually did succeed in finding, and a few further manuscripts coming into his hands were added at the end of the list. The collection and list were then laid aside, a few manuscripts finding their way among the rest of the collector's archaeological litter, the bulk, however, within reach of the parsimonious fingers of Betsy the baker of pies. Long afterwards her master discovered his loss, and no longer in the least remembering either the extent of his collection or the nature of his list, added in a fit of not unnatural vexation the famous memorandum. If this be so, we have undoubtedly to lament the loss of a few pieces, perhaps of considerable interest, but not by any means the dramatic holocaust that has made famous the name of the 'pie-eating Somerset Herald.'

W. W. GREG.

AN HISTORIC BIBLE AT HEIDELBERG.

THE University Library at Heidelberg possesses a very early copy of the English Authorised Version of the Bible, not indeed of the editio princeps, but of the first quarto edition, published in 1612. As the Tercentenary has reminded us, there were two sets of early editions of the 1611 versions, distinguished as the 'He' and 'She' Bibles respectively according as they read in Ruth iii. 15 'he went into the citie' or 'she went into the citie,' the former being the correct rendering. All the 1612 quartos are 'He' Bibles, but again there are two issues, readily distinguishable by the headline of sig. [H. 5] verso. The Heidelberg copy is one of those which read, 'The Galatians reproued. To the Galaitans. The Law a scholemaster to Christ'—that is to say, it has the characteristic misprint 'Galaitans.' In it the following errata of the 1611 'He' Bible still remain uncorrected: 'Emorite' for 'Amorite' in Gen. x. 16; 'hoopes' for 'hooks' in Exod. xxxviii. 11; 'offred, offered' for 'offered' in Ezra iii. 5; 'that he may have' for 'that ye may have' in Ezek. vi. 8; 'poured it'

for 'poured it not' in Ezek. xxiv. 7. The Bible is a complete one, including genealogies, map of Canaan, and the Apocrypha, and is preceded by 'The Booke of Common Prayer, with the Psalter or Psalmes of David, Of that Translation which is appointed to be vsed in Churches. Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie. 1611.' At the end of the volume is the metrical version of the Psalms (Sternhold and Hopkins), 'Imprinted for the Companie of Stationers. 1612.' The Prayer Book is in black letter, but all the rest is in Roman type.

If this were all, there would be nothing particularly remarkable about this Heidelberg Bible; and as a matter of fact, until a short time ago it was standing all unheeded along with much dusty Old Testament literature in the theological division of the library (pressmark Q. 397). Now, however, it has been withdrawn from obscurity, and it will be accorded a place in the permanent exhibition of choice books and MSS. which is at present undergoing re-arrangement at the hands of Professor Sillib, one of the librarians. It is beyond doubt a relic of the unfortunate Elizabeth, Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia, daughter of our James I. If it was not used by her personally, it at least belonged to a member of her household.

The book is battered now, but it was once a handsome volume. It is bound in calf, and both covers are stamped in gold with a design occupying almost the whole surface and surrounding the royal arms as borne by James I. and his Stuart successors. The edges are gilt and impressed with a dotted

scroll-work pattern. The fastenings that the book apparently once possessed have disappeared.

The first internal feature to be noted is in the Litany, where one of the petitions runs: 'That it may please thee to blesse and preserue our gracious Queene Anne, Prince *Charles, Frederic Prince Elektor palatin, and the lady Elizabeth his wife,*' the words in italics being neatly written in imitation of Roman type on two narrow slips of paper, which are pasted in so as to hide the printed words which followed 'Prince.' On the next page, also in the Litany, there is 'A prayer for the Queene and Prince, and other the King and Queenes children,' which has been similarly altered, so that it reads: 'Almighty God, which hast promised to be a Father of thine elect and of their seed, we humbly beseech thee to blesse our gracious Queen Anne, Prince *Charles, Frederic Prince Elektor Palatin, & the Lady Elizabeth his Wife.*' This time the paper slips, though still adhering to the margin, have been so loosened that it is possible to read the underlying printed text. The words designed to be obliterated are: 'Henry, and all the King and Queenes Royall Progenie.' Prince Henry, it may be remarked, died on 6th November, 1612. The Princess Elizabeth and the Elektor Frederic V. went through the ceremony of betrothal on 27th December, 1612, and Mrs. Everett Green ('Elizabeth Queen of Bohemia,' new edition, revised by Mrs. S. C. Lomas, 1909, p. 46) says that 'from this time the Prince [Frederic] was prayed for publicly in the churches among the children of the King.' Elizabeth, however, could hardly have

been called his wife until after their marriage, which took place on St. Valentine's Day, 14th February, 1613.

Even if those paper slips were pasted in the Litany originally for use in England, there is little doubt that the handsome Bible and service book made its way to Heidelberg and was used by somebody in Elizabeth's private chapel at the Castle there. And afterwards, when the Princess and her husband moved to Prague (October, 1619), to take possession of the crown of Bohemia, the book must have accompanied them. At any rate it was there when, scarcely more than a year later, after the battle of the White Hill, 8th November, 1620, the Winter King and Queen fled to Breslau, leaving a considerable quantity of their belongings behind at Prague to fall into the hands of the victorious Imperial troops. An inscription in faded ink on the flyleaf of the Bible says, in a hand which the Chief Librarian, Professor Wille, does not doubt to be contemporary, 'Ex Arce Pragensi post victoriā Cæsaream. A° 1620.' In these words, with many a flourish of his pen, the unknown writer has recorded the fact that this book was part of the loot which the Imperialists got at Prague. A subsequent owner has copied out the inscription immediately below in a more legible script. A third owner has appended to this the note: 'v. Mosheimii Histor. eccles. p. 863.' Mosheim's 'Institutiones' were not published until 1755, and the part of his work referred to is devoted to an account of the ecclesiastical condition of England under James I. A little lower down on the flyleaf

there are two more references in the same handwriting: 'S. Nachrichten von einer Hallischen Bibliothek, 7. band, p. 95. sqq. 101. sqq. Walchii Bibliotheca Theolog. Selecta, Tom. IV. p. 124.' The 'Nachrichten' quoted appeared at Halle in 1751; J. G. Walch's 'Bibliotheca' was published at Jena in 1765. At both places information will be found respecting the English translations of the Bible.

On the back of the flyleaf, in the same hand, a passage in praise of the English Prayer Book has been copied from a French translation of the 'Tatler.' 'Cette Liturgie est parfaitement belle. Il n'y en eut jamais, ni dans aucune nation, ni dans aucune Langue, dont les sentimens et les expressions repondent mieux à la petitesse de l'homme, et à la grandeur de la Divinité. v. Steele Babillard, ou Le Philosophe Nouvelliste,' Tom. II. art. 31. p. 338. I have not been able to verify this quotation, as the French translation is not accessible here in Heidelberg; but the thought is repeated by Steele in No. 147 of the 'Spectator.'

The same hand again has written in the margin at the beginning of the Communion Service: 'v. Bayle Dictionn. Tom. ii. p. 842 b au fin.' The 1740 edition of Bayle contains at that place a quotation from Burnet on the Communion Service in the Elizabethan Prayer Book.

In Acts vi. 3 the word 'we' in the phrase 'whom we may appoint' has been underlined, and the same writer has noted in the margin: 'Butler Hudibras. p. 381. Baumgartē Hallische Biblioth. vol. VII. p. 105.' That is to say, the owner,

having read in Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten's 'Nachrichten' for February, 1751, that some copies of the English Bible as late as 1689 still contained the misprint 'ye' instead of 'we' in Acts vi. 3, turned like a good bibliophil to the passage in his own copy to see what the reading was there. This misprint originated in the first Cambridge Bible of 1629, and lent fictitious aid to the anti-episcopal arguments of some sectaries. What edition of Hudibras is referred to, I do not know, but presumably the passage intended is Part III., canto ii., ll. 7-10:

So e'er the storm of war broke out,
Religion spawn'd a various rout
Of petulant capricious sects,
The maggots of corrupted texts.

I conjecture that all these notes in the third hand are the work of the only former owner of the volume whose name can be stated with certainty—Erhard Riedlin. His engraved armorial bookplate in rococo style, with the inscription 'Ex Bibliotheca Erhardi Riedlin,' and signed J. A. Fridrich jun. A.V., is pasted inside the cover. Jakob Andreas Fridrich, the younger, of Augsburg (A.V. = Augustae Vindelicorum), was engraver to the court of Württemberg, and a frequent designer of book-plates. Count Leiningen-Westerburg in his work on German Bookplates selects the Riedlin bookplate for reproduction as the most characteristic specimen of this artist's work. The facsimile is given on p. 229 of the German edition ('Deutsche

und oesterreichische Bibliothekzeichen Ex Libris,' Stuttgart, 1901), and is no doubt to be found also in the English translation by G. R. Dennis (Bell and Sons, 1901). The learned author dates it *circa* 1750, and this agrees with the dates of the books cited in the MS. notes, and with the only other fact that I have been able to discover about Erhard Riedlin, viz., that he graduated at Göttingen in 1742, for the British Museum possesses his 'Dissertatio Historica sistens vitam, itinera et scripta Fr. F. Fabri' (pressmark T. 1519/10). Perhaps he was a relative of Veit Riedlin, a physician of Ulm, who is the only person of the name in Jöcher's 'Gelehrtenlexicon.' I find no mention of him in Meusel's 'Gelehrtes Teutschland.'

How or when Riedlin's old English Bible was acquired by the Heidelberg University Library is unknown. It has certainly been there for forty years, and probably a good deal longer, to judge from the handwriting of the slip on which it is catalogued. Possibly it was offered for sale and bought with full appreciation of its historical significance, but if so its importance has been overlooked and forgotten. It is not at all surprising that a royal book should have passed into private hands after the battle in 1620, but that it should have come back after more than a century, perhaps after two centuries, to such an appropriate abiding place as Heidelberg is indeed strange. At least one other of Elizabeth's books has undergone a similar fate. There is in the British Museum Library (pressmark C. 38. i. 10) a folio copy of Raleigh's

'History of the World,' 1614, of which the catalogue says: 'From a series of MS. notes on the title-page and following leaf, it appears that this volume originally belonged to the Princess Palatine Elizabeth, daughter of James I., and was left behind her at Prague on her flight from that city, November, 1620, when it fell into the hands of a Spaniard named Verdugo. At the recapture of Prague by the Swedes, 1648, it was recovered by a German of the name of Klee, who restored it to John Philip Frederick, son of the Princess.'

The Heidelberg Bible seems to have been used at some time before the period of Riedlin's ownership by somebody who was learning English. In the early chapters of Genesis the words *nostrils*, *aprons*, *belly*, *bruise*, *heelee*, *sorrow*, *shalbe*, *hearkenened*, *coates of skinnnes*, *euer*, *thoughts*, are underlined in faded ink; and against the word *beguiled* there is written in the same ink 'seducere. decipio.' But, as so often happens, the industry of the careful marker gave out before he had got very far—no farther than chapter VI—and the few other markings in the book seem to indicate another sort of reader. The man who underlined in Isaiah liii. 6 'layd on him the iniquitie of vs all,' and the marginal note there, 'Heb. hee hath made the iniquitie of vs all to meet on him,' and in Hebrews ix. 15 'for the redemption of the transgressions,' hardly had philological or linguistic ends in view. Those two underlinings, and the occasional ink-blots here and there, enable the imagination to conjure up a picture of Elizabeth's chaplain preparing his sermons with this volume open before him.

There is one other MS. entry, and one only, to speculate about. It is the first one of all in the book. Inside the cover, in the middle of the top edge of the paper, there is written in yet another early hand: '15 of August.' There is no date of the year, and though a long worm-hole comes rather close to the end of the word 'August,' it is practically certain that there never was any. One is tempted to think that the 15th of August was the date on which the book was received by its original owner. The earliest possible year would then be 1612; the latest 1618, because when the day came round again Frederic was on the eve of being elected King of Bohemia, and in this book he is only the Elector Palatine. Mrs. Everett Green (*op. cit.*, p. 24) gives an undated extract from the account book kept for Elizabeth by her governor, Lord Harrington, recording a payment for 'a great Bible' and other books 'by her Highness specially appointed to be provided.' But 'a great Bible' would naturally mean a folio, and apparently (*op. cit.*, p. 20, n. 1) the accounts refer only to the period from Michaelmas, 1612, to Lady Day, 1613. Some authorities give the date of Elizabeth's birth as 15th August, 1596, in which case it would be easy to suppose that the Heidelberg Bible was a birthday present, but other authorities say it was 16th or 19th August. Mrs. Everett Green, with charming impartiality, gives 16th August at the beginning of her book (p. 2), and 19th August elsewhere. Her footnote, however, on p. 106, shows pretty clearly that really the Elector's birthday was on 16th August (she says

19th on p. 97), and Elizabeth's on 19th August. On 15th August, 1615 (or was it in 1616? Mrs. Everett Green's account is not quite clear, p. 106) Frederic and Elizabeth returned to Heidelberg from their tour in the Upper Palatinate. Did she find this Bible, a present from England, awaiting her then? 15th August, if not a red-letter day in Elizabeth's family history, was very near to several. It was on his birthday, 16th August, 1619, that Frederic's election as King of Bohemia took place.

If we give up the riddle of '15th August' as insoluble, we may still conjecture that the Bible was supplied for the use of some member of Elizabeth's suite. If so, for whom more naturally than for the chaplain? By her marriage contract (signed 16th May, 1612) she was to have forty-nine servants, to be kept at her husband's expense, and among them was mentioned a chaplain with a salary of £50 (*op. cit.*, p. 61). As a matter of fact, in the suite that accompanied her to Germany there were two chaplains, Dr. Alexander Chapman (who got called Scapman by the Germans, and died in 1629 a Prebendary of Canterbury, where he is buried), and Mr. Twyst (*op. cit.*, p. 416). On her arrival at Heidelberg Elizabeth, staunch Churchwoman as she was, demanded a chapel of her own (*ib.* 89, n. 2). Colonel Schomberg, who was Frederic's factotum, visited England at the close of 1613, and on his return succeeded in obtaining certain privileges for Elizabeth—*e.g.*, 'that her chaplain should reside at the castle gate, and have a suitable place prepared near her apartments, in which to conduct the English service'

(*ib.* 95). According to Schomberg's regulations for her household (1615) all requests for alms were to be laid before the chaplain (*ib.* 102). On her journey out from England she had given away £26 in charity, the chaplain acting as almoner (*ib.* 74). Though constant in attendance at her own chapel, she was anxious to communicate at least once a year in the 'great church' with her husband, to show the people that her creed was not essentially different from her husband's (*ib.* 104), and she evinced the same desire at Prague (*ib.* 147).

Dr. Donne, the poet, was at Heidelberg in June, 1619, as chaplain to Lord Doncaster's embassy, and preached twice before Elizabeth and her husband. He, no doubt, brought his own books with him, though it is just possible that he may have seen or handled the volume now at Heidelberg. He preached once from Rom. xiii. 11—but there are no blots on that page! and the verse is not marked.

Perhaps it was the 'zealous and godly' Dr. Chapman who, on the same page, in Rom. xii. 17, has supplied neatly in ink the all-important missing word *no* before *man* in the sentence which there stands printed, 'Recompence to man euill for euill.' Though less glaring, the error is really as serious as the omission of the negative particle in the seventh commandment, which cost the printers of the so-called 'Wicked' Bible (8vo, 1631) confiscation and a fine of £300. Chapman's last sermon at Heidelberg, 26th September, 1619, just before his mistress set out for Prague, was from James iv. 13 (*op. cit.*, 132), but again there are no blots or scorings to indicate that he used this Bible in

preparing his sermon. He accompanied the court to Bohemia, but how or when he returned to England Mrs. Everett Green was unable to discover.

Frederic attended Elizabeth's English service right up to the last, 15th October, 1620 (*op. cit.* 161), at a time when goods were already being packed up or sent on in advance in anticipation of their leaving Prague (p. 162). The enemy were already in the neighbourhood. Twenty baggage waggons of Frederic's, in one of which were his garter insignia, were seized in the battle of the White Hill (p. 165). 'In the haste of the flight, many valuable things were left behind, including not only a large portion of the wardrobe and personal property of Elizabeth, but the royal crown and ornaments and all Frederic's private papers' (p. 166). Nethersole, Elizabeth's secretary, returned to Prague at some risk to fetch his books and papers (p. 167). And actually on the flight Elizabeth's own attendants are alleged to have pillaged some of the baggage waggons.

But the Heidelberg Bible, it must be supposed, fell into the hands of the enemy. The prayers in Elizabeth's handwriting which Mrs. Everett Green (pp. 122-3, uncorrected by Mrs. Lomas) says are in Heidelberg University Library (Cod. Pal. Germ. 661, 690, 694) are, unfortunately, apocryphal. They are prayers of the 'Electress Elizabeth,' it is true, but of that Elizabeth who was wife of the Elector Johann Casimir (see J. Wille, 'Die Deutschen Pfälzer Handschriften des xvi. und xvii. Jahrhunderts der Universitäts-Bibliothek in Heidelberg,' Heidelberg, 1903). The Bible is, therefore,

unique at the University Library as a relic of the Queen of Hearts, 'th' eclipse and glory of her kind,' whose short residence there brought so much gaiety into the old capital of the Palatinate, whose cheerfulness never deserted her in all her trials, and whose memory even now casts a glamour over the castle ruins which they would otherwise not possess for the English visitor to Heidelberg.

LIONEL R. M. STRACHAN.

THE COVERDALE BIBLE OF 1535.



THE question where and by whom the Coverdale Bible of 1535 was printed has long remained one of the puzzles of English bibliography. Mr. A. W. Pollard, in his 'Records of the English Bible' (pp. 12 and 13), sums up the existing evidence in the following words:

'Coverdale graduated as Bachelor of Canon Law at Cambridge in 1531, but thereafter until 1536 his movements are unknown.¹ There has consequently been much dispute as to where and by what firm his Bible was printed in 1535. Early in the eighteenth century, however, Humphrey Wanley, the librarian of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, suggested that the printer was probably Christopher Froschouer of Zurich, who fifteen years later produced another edition of it. Investigation showed that two of the larger types of the English Bible of 1535 were in the possession of Froschouer, but these were used also by other German printers, and the matter remained undecided until, in his article on Coverdale in the "Dictionary of National Biography," Mr. H. R. Tedder, by the kindness of Dr. Christian Ginsburg, was enabled to state that he had seen two leaves of a Swiss-German Bible printed in the same German type as the text of Coverdale's English version. The complete book,

¹ If the story that he was subsidized while translating by Jacob van Meteren of Antwerp be believed, he was probably part of the time at Antwerp.'

an unrecorded edition of 1529-30 from the press of Froschouer, had once been in Dr. Ginsburg's possession, but I learn from Dr. Ginsburg himself that this disappeared from his library in a very painful manner, and only these leaves remain. While it is regrettable that the complete evidence can no longer be produced, they may be taken as sufficiently establishing that it was at Zurich and by Froschouer that the first printed English Bible was issued.'

Some time ago, when cataloguing the Swedish section of the Bible Society's Library, I had occasion to collate carefully the first Swedish Bible, printed in folio by Georg Richolff at Upsala in 1540-1. The types used for the text and the headlines seemed strangely familiar, and it was not long before I recognized that they were closely similar to, if not identical with, those employed in printing the English Bible of 1535. So far as I am aware, no writer has hitherto drawn attention to this fact. Recently, at the British Museum, I showed the two books side by side to Mr. Pollard, and he and Mr. Scholderer very kindly examined them with expert eyes, and gave me the benefit of their opinion upon the text-type. Their verdict is that the letters and signs (punctuation marks, etc.) appear to be the same in the two books, with the following trifling exceptions: (1) the E in the Swedish Bible is perhaps a little broader than that in the English Bible; (2) the interrogation marks differ; (3) the Swedish Bible has a large double hyphen, while the English Bible has a small single hyphen. Before the printing of the Swedish Bible, however, the type must have been re-cast

on a smaller body, twenty lines of text in this Bible measuring 88 mm. against 92 mm. in the English Bible.

Now, whence did this type, or the materials for producing it, come to Upsala? Dr. Aksel Andersson, the Chief Librarian of the Royal University Library of Upsala, who has generously supplied my colleague, Mr. Darlow, and myself with valuable notes on Swedish editions down to the year 1800, informs me that the printer, G. Richolff, was specially summoned from Lubeck to supervise the production of the first Swedish Bible at Upsala, and it may perhaps be presumed that he brought his materials with him.

The significance of this information in regard to the question of the *provenance* of the English Bible of 1535 is obvious. The ascription of that important book to the press of Christopher Froschouer of Zurich rests mainly on the fact that Froschouer had used the same text-type five years earlier in printing a Swiss-German Bible. It is remarkable, however, that no book issued from Froschouer's press subsequently to 1530 is known to exhibit this particular type. With the new evidence before us, therefore, the conjecture may plausibly be made that soon after 1530 Froschouer sold the punches for this type to a Lubeck printer, and that the type was used at Lubeck for printing the English Bible of 1535, before being transferred to Upsala. It should not be difficult to obtain further information about Richolff, and about the books produced by his firm at Lubeck. And if we could discover that the type in question was used in any editions

276 THE COVERDALE BIBLE OF 1535.

printed there before, or just after, 1535, we might lay our hands on the key to the problem of the origin of the Coverdale Bible.

I have written this rather hasty note in the hope that someone better qualified than myself, and familiar with the presses of Zurich and Lubeck, may be tempted to follow up the clue—if it can be called a clue—and may win the gratitude of bibliographers by ultimately solving one of the most obscure riddles in the history of the English Bible.

H. F. MOULE.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

THE French novels of the last three months do not include anything of striking excellence. Pierre Mille's 'Caillow et Tili' is a penetrating study of little children, written with a perfect understanding of, and sympathy with, the childish mind. With all the care taken of the child in these modern days, few realize either how children are affected by the things they hear said by grown-up people, or how absolutely children take things for granted. That is really one of the most important things that those responsible for the bringing up of children need to know, and Pierre Mille proves it with great insight, and in clear and simple, yet pointed language.

'Les Exilés' is an Alsatian novel, in which the author, Paul Acker, seeks to show how Alsace still remains French. It is not very interesting as a work of fiction, but helps us to realize that the feeling of French nationality persists in Alsace even after forty years.

'La Prison de Verre,' by Gaston Chérau, is an interesting study of *bourgeois* psychology, and of the persecution and tyranny that it is in the power of parents-in-law in France to exercise on a daughter-in-law even after her husband is dead.

278 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

The character of Aristide Chevallier, the father-in-law, an egoist and hypocrite of the Pecksniffian order, is admirably drawn.

So far I only know André Gide as the author of the very interesting and beautifully written novel, 'La Porte Etroite.' In a book of lectures and essays, entitled 'Nouveaux Prétextes: reflexions sur quelques points de littérature et de morale,' he shows himself a critic of much freshness and originality. The most striking are the two lectures dealing with 'l'évolution du théâtre' and 'l'importance du public.' In the first the three faces of the subject, so to speak, are dealt with: the point of view of the dramatist, of the actor, and of the spectator. Art, Gide declares, is always the result of restraint. For example, take the sonnets of Shakespeare, Ronsard, Petrarch, Michel Angelo, or the Terza Rima of Dante, the fugues of Bach. In fact, 'la force d'expression du souffle lyrique soit en raison de sa compression . . . l'art naît de contrainte, vit de lutte, meurt de liberté.'

The plays now presented in our theatres are poor art; they are too episodic, too close to the spectator; the artist must preserve the distance between the stage and the spectator if he is to create the illusion without which no stage play can successfully attain its object. The coming dramatist must set aside realism and give us new forms of heroism and new heroic figures. Gide is quite certain that the artist has duties to the public, just as the public has duties to the artist. The great exponents of art in the time of the Renaissance invariably thought of their public,

and would not have understood what was meant by art for art. Goethe held a similar view when he denounced the *naturel* in acting. We call it sincerity to-day to act as if there were no one in the theatre. I remember seeing a great actress who prides herself on her naturalness; the whole time she was on the stage she was either crouching behind a big sofa, or hiding her face behind a big fan. The artist should know whom he is addressing. Nowadays he either breaks with his epoch and shuts himself up, as it were, within himself, or flatters the mob, and so scarcely deserves the name of artist. Gide's argument is interesting and is eloquently stated. But it must be confessed that both irony and paradox have their part in it. Gide is a frank pagan: he declares that the Greeks drew the portrait of their ideal in their art, and that with them heaven touched earth, gods became men, and men became gods. Then when society demanded that art should be Christian, the artist served up what was asked of him. If Gide is right, it would be hypocrisy and not sincerity that produces great art. But however that may be, he is probably right in thinking that art must respond to some need of society, or it will not flourish.

Six months ago I noticed here a book on Meredith by a Frenchman, and now M. F. A. Hedgcock devotes five hundred pages to a minute, almost a scientific, study of the work of 'Thomas Hardy. *Penseur et artiste.*' The book has obtained for its author the degree of 'Docteur-ès-lettres.' He begins with a chapter of biography. Then follows a study of the early verses, which

are characterised as containing the expression of Hardy's temperament; but I imagine this is not peculiar to Hardy. Poets usually express their temperament in their verse, especially in the lyrics of their youth. In a chapter headed 'In search of a method,' the conclusion is reached that Hardy's method is a combination of realism and imagination. Hardy's fatalism and pessimism have each a chapter. Another deals with his attitude to nature, in which his critic declares that Hardy's imagination seeks to pass beyond the veil—that he is a believer without faith.

The chapter on Hardy as a writer is perhaps the most satisfactory. Much is said as to his care for form, in which he shows a most exacting aesthetic sense. His method of composition is dramatic. The accessory characters are everywhere subordinated, the interest is concentrated on a little group, the principal figure of which is generally a woman. The style is very individual, and the charm of Hardy's prose is due to his wide knowledge, his imagination, and his penetrating artistic perception.

M. Hedgcock declares in conclusion that as a thinker Hardy takes rank among the great modern pessimists, like Leopardi, De Vigny, Schopenhauer, and Renan. He has given the most beautiful expression to be found in English literature to 'la philosophie desespérée.' The last pages contain a comparison between Hardy and Meredith, and Hedgcock considers Hardy the greater artist. He sums up thus:

'Il est de mode aujourd'hui d'exalter Meredith comme philosophe et de rabaisser Hardy au rang des simples

conteurs. C'est un jugement hâtif et qui manque de profondeur. Que la philosophie du premier soit, par sa limitation même, plus pratique et plus utile, nous n'en doutons pas. Mais le parallèle que nous venons d'instituer montre combien la pensée de M. Hardy dépasse celle de son contemporain et avec quel courage elle aborde le problème de l'absolu. Meredith ressemble à Fielding et à Thackeray, il s'astreint à la stricte réalité, retranchant de sa considération tout ce qui n'est pas visible; et dans ses tableaux, qu'éclaire un fort bon sens, il enseigne par l'exemple; son système positif simplifie les problèmes en en amoindissant la portée. Derrière l'œuvre de M. Hardy il y a un système universale et complet, qui la rend solide et homogène; ce n'est pas là son moindre titre à être considéré comme le romancier le plus éminent de son époque.'

I do not know that much is gained either for knowledge or for criticism by comparisons of this sort; but sometimes they are suggestive, and when they lead to thought are justified. But it is open to question whether such an elaborate analysis of the work of any novelist, living or dead, whatever his greatness, is needed for the right understanding and appreciation of him. Drama and fiction, if they are to touch our hearts, must make an immediate and direct appeal, and can, better than any other form of literature, dispense with guides and interpreters.

Mademoiselle Lydie Morel has chosen as the subject of a thesis presented to the faculty of letters at the University of Neuchâtel the life and work of Jean Ogier de Gombauld. As poet he is the subject of an essay by Faguet, but as prose writer and moralist he is almost unknown. Too much

admired in his own day, so is he too much forgotten now. But although he was not a great author, he could occasionally be charming, often witty, and was never negligent. He wrote prose which, if generally cold, was elegant, and which sometimes vibrated with passion. He was best in his sonnets, which were little inferior to those of Desportes and Du Bellay. Boileau certainly said that only two or three of them were worth anything, but it must be remembered that it was also Boileau who wrote, 'Un sonnet sans défaut vaut seul un long poème.' Mlle. Morel concerns herself rather with the man than the writer, and sets herself to show how Gombauld reconciled his protestantism with his functions of 'poète-courtesan.'

Hermann Sudermann has just published a volume of short stories, entitled 'Die indische Lilie.' The tales are either erotic and ugly, or fanciful and dull. The elderly libertine who, grown tired of his dissolute life, determines to ask the woman who has cared for him in silence all along to marry him, and finds himself too late in the field, is not a new figure in fiction, nor is he treated here with any freshness. But Sudermann makes the evil of such a life abundantly clear. The tale entitled 'Der Lebensplan,' however, is on a higher level, and contains one of those portraits of a wicked, unscrupulous woman which Sudermann draws with so much skill and truth. A girl and boy meet; the boy is ambitious, and desires to study for a doctor; the girl is greatly attracted to him, and, desiring to help him, devises a plan of life which

will enable her to do so. A child is the result of the boy and girl adventure, but she cleverly conceals the condition of things and manages to secure another man as her husband, who naturally passes as the father. Other schemes are equally successful, and she is able to send considerable sums of money to the boy, whom she does not see again until a much later period, when by foul means she has got rid of all the obstacles, her husband included, in the way of her marriage with this idol of her youth. When they do meet she finds him to be a successful medical practitioner of the most ordinary type, fat, honest, commonplace. He had never realized her feeling for him, had accepted the money as a loan, which he now pays back; but discovering her wish, and learning the existence of the child, he is ready to marry her. The woman, however, is too clever not to understand that no power in heaven or on earth could break down the barriers or raze the walls that stand between them everlastingly.

Another volume of short stories, 'Schwache Helden,' by Hugo Salus, is delightful reading. It contains four tales, the hero of each being the victim of some weakness of character. In one he suffers from invincible shyness, but the girl he loves comes to his aid; in another he is equally shy, but the woman who might have helped him fails him, and both miss the best in life. In yet another overweening vanity is the weakness, and the translator who sets out to improve on Byron comes to utter grief. In the last tale the hero has a kind of cruelty not unknown in weak characters, but

through a woman he is led to better courses. All are admirable sketches, and cannot fail to please the most critical reader. They are full of charm and wit, and written in a beautiful lucid style.

Otto Ernst is better known as playwright and novelist than as critic. But in 'Blühender Lorbeer. Plaudereien und Andachten über deutsche Dichter,' he has produced an original and unconventional volume of criticism—although in his preface he denies that the book contains criticism at all—that is well worthy of attention in these days, when we hasten to forget the work of a past generation, and unduly laud that of a new. The authors he discusses all belong to the past, Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Hebbel, Reuter, Keller, Anzengruber, and Fontane, to arrange them in something like chronological order. But Ernst, and quite rightly, does not trouble to do it. He begins with Fontane and ends with Lessing. Ernst's desire is to make his readers love the writings of the men he describes. To love a poet is a different thing from admiring him. And I believe that no one can read Ernst's pages without the desire to know more intimately through their work the poets of whom he treats.

He points out one of the great gifts of Heine—often too little noted—the wonderful way in which he handled the German language, a fact of which Schubert and Schumann were quick to take advantage, for they understood that speech is not only the expression of soul, but soul itself. He shows, too, how Goethe is more than a poet, he is a whole world, a man in whom all the great

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 285

features of human existence came to splendid fruition. The lesson Goethe teaches is joy in life, with all its beauty and splendour. Yet, as a rule, Germans prefer Schiller to Goethe. Ernst thus explains the preference:

‘In Schiller’s verses the storm and the sea mingle their organ tones, drums are heard, and bells ring. Every ear can easily hear drums and bells. Goethe demands a more refined ear. If he is read with that ear, it is soon felt how with him the rocks and the trees make music, the flowers and the herbs, the clouds and the stars sing, and life and human fate sound as a great holy hymn, and to the reader, as to the poet,

‘Sein Ohr vernimmt den Einklang der Natur.
Das weit Zerstreute sammelt sein Gemüt,
Und sein Gefühl belebt das Unbelebte.’

One of the most interesting essays is on Gottfried Keller as a lyric poet. Keller’s prose is well known, and most people who read German are acquainted with ‘Der grüne Heinrich.’ But his charming lyrics are sometimes neglected. Poems like ‘Die Spinnerin’ and ‘Die Zeit geht nicht’ ought to find a place in every anthology of German verse. In the latter he expresses the thought that it is not time that goes, but it is we who go.

‘Die Zeit geht nicht, sie stehet still,
Wir ziehen durch sie hin;
Sie ist ein Karawanseraï,
Wir sind die Pilger d’rin.

.

'Es blitzt ein Tropfen Morgentau
Im Strahl des Sonnenlichts;
Ein Tag kann eine Perle sein
Und ein Jahrhundert nichts.'

Ernst is an idealist: he believes in romance and beauty and fancy and the things of the spirit, and to read him and learn about the poets whom he reverences is most refreshing and inspiring.

* * * * *

The following recently published books deserve attention:—

Silhouettes historiques. Par le Marquis de Ségur.

Sketches of history and of literary history from the time of Louis XIII. onwards, including Bourdelot, the physician of the Grand Condé, Madame Lieven, and Guizot.

Correspondance inédite de Marie-Caroline reine de Naples et de Sicile avec le Marquis de Gallo, publiée et annotée par le commandant M. H. Weil et le Marquis L. Di Somma Circello.

There is a preface by M. H. Welschinger. Vol. I. covers the years 1785-98, and Vol. II. 1799-1806. The correspondence is an historical document of the first order, since it was not destined for publication.

Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist. Von Friedrich Gundolf.

The author deals very fully with the way in which Shakespeare has penetrated into German literature up to the Romantics. He divides his book into three parts—Shakespeare 'als Stoff, als Form, als Gehalt.'

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 287

Max Reinhardt. Von Siegfried Jacobsohn.

An account of the talented and accomplished director of the Deutsche Theatre in Berlin. It is of interest that in eight years he has produced a number of Shakespeare's plays in a fashion, both as regards acting and artistic setting, worthy of the great dramatist. The plays are 'The Merry Wives of Windsor,' 'The Merchant of Venice,' 'The Winter's Tale,' 'Romeo and Juliet,' 'Twelfth Night,' 'Lear,' 'Hamlet,' 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' and the 'Taming of the Shrew.'

Adolf Fischhof. Das Lebensbild eines österreichischen Politikers. Von Richard Charmatz.

An Austrian statesman, well known but little understood.

Grillparzers Werke. Herausgegeben von August Sauer.

The first volume of a new, good critical edition, much needed by the lover and student of German drama. Grillparzer is a classic, and perhaps the greatest German dramatist after Schiller and Goethe. This volume promises well, and seems to possess all the characteristics required by such an edition.

Une carrière d'artiste au XIX^e siècle. Charles Landelle 1821-1908. Par Casimir Stryienski.

Landelle drew in chalk many French poets of the nineteenth century. He visited England in 1849, in company with Gautier and de Nerval. Reproductions of his chalk drawings of Gautier, de Musset, and de Nerval appear in this volume.

Ordres et Apostilles de Napoléon (1799-1815). Vol. I. Par Arthur Chuquet.

These notes were found while searching the 'Archives de la guerre,' and serve as a sort of supplement to Napoleon's correspondence. They show how a word, a brief sentence, sufficed both the Consul and the Emperor to express his will, settle a question, remove a difficulty, pronounce a verdict, sum up a man's character.

288 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Les femmes de l'émigration. Par Joseph Turquan.

A very interesting account of the women *émigrées* from the beginning, when they only expected to be away a few weeks, and it was the fashion to ask, 'Quand partez-vous? Où comptez-vous aller?' and so through all their adventures in the different lands in which they settled.

Über Goethes Gedichte. Von Viktor Hehn. Aus dessen Nachlass herausgegeben von Eduard von der Hellen.

Lectures given in 1851, and now published for the first time. Preceded by a valuable essay on German poetry after Schiller and Goethe. The lyrics of Goethe are classified according to subjects, and each poem interpreted and criticised, and the whole forms a useful and inspiring guide for those beginning to study Goethe.

ELIZABETH LEE.

THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS.¹

IT is difficult to follow the arguments of the German bibliographers. They write in the belief that Gutenberg is the inventor of printing; that all the books and types mentioned above are his work, and that no other opinion is possible. Hence they refer us for evidence of his activity, genius, skill, etc., often on one and the same page or in one and the same sentence, to various letters or signs of contractions or printers' habits, occurring in different books printed in different types, so that they mingle the characteristics of the Paris 'Donatus' with those of the 'Turk-kalendar'; those of B³⁶ with those of B⁴²; those of B⁴² with those of the 'Astronomical and Turk-kalendar,' the 'Cisianus,' etc.; the types of the two Indulgences of 1454 are compared with those of the Psalter of 1457 ('Veröffentl.' i, 8, 9, 40, 44, 45; iii, 8). And all this to prove that, though there may be differences between the types in size and form, some of their peculiarities show that they are all the work of one master. Yet, after having read pages of such intricate 'evidence' for attributing books to Gutenberg, you may find doubts expressed as to whether he could, after all, have printed them

¹ Continued from page 211.

(*ibid.* iii, 18). In none of the discussions, in which even the early Dutch incunabula are mixed up (*ibid.* i, 16), is there any systematic arrangement or classification of the types or 'phases' of types. It is true, Dziatzko ('Gutenberg's Druckerpraxis,' pp. 51-53, 60, 61, 64-66, 68) gives valuable tables of letters, contractions, etc., extracted from B³⁶ and B⁴², for the purpose of showing the great 'likeness' between them. And Zedler has done the same ('Veröffentl.' i.) for the types of the (1) Paris 'Donatus'; (2) 'Astronomical Kalendar'; (3) 'Turk-kalendar'; (4) 'Cisianus'; (5) 'Laxier-kalendar'; (6) British Museum 'Donatus' of 27 lines; (7) B³⁶. But his tables are incomplete, omitting, for instance, the combined letters, though he speaks of them at some length (*ibid.* i, 17). And on p. 15 of his treatise on the 'Weltgericht' (*ibid.* iii.) he says that the 'Astronomical Kalendar' for 1448 has only the *i* with a slanting stroke above it (see also *ibid.* i, 7, 8, and Schwenke, *ibid.* ii, 9), though his photograph (*ibid.* i.) shows that it has also an *i* with a bow in li. 2 (*ist*), another in li. 5 (*in*), and other places.

One thing is clear, the 'method' adopted by the chief German bibliographers of the present day in examining, describing and grouping the earliest German incunabula, has buried the subject under a mass of learned dissertations, without enabling us to realize who printed them. Gutenberg is credited with 'fine aesthetic feelings,' various 'conceptions of art, symmetry, harmony, etc.'; but it is difficult to see how he could have executed the large amount of work attributed to him if we

believe the documents that speak of him and his doings (see above Documents No. xiii, and below Nos. xxii, xxiii, xxiv, etc.), from, say, 1442 to his death in 1468, all proving that during these years he was in serious financial difficulties.

As regards Gutenberg's genius and qualities, none of the three authors specially named above seems to have taken into account, during their minute researches, that the art of printing is the development and continuation of the *art of writing* (perhaps more immediately of that of Blockprinting), and that its inventor, whoever he was, invented the moveable metal types, but not the shape and form of his letters, which he modelled, necessarily and as a matter of course, on the hand-writings in vogue in his time and locality.

Occasionally they speak of manuscripts having been the models for Gutenberg's types ('Veröffentl.' i., 20, 21), but at the same moment they represent him as having created independent¹ forms of type for B4² and his other books, and assert that the types of B3⁶ are nothing but a rough imitation of those of B4², though their founder, if he was not Gutenberg, took pains to follow as much as possible Gutenberg's principles (Schwenke, 'Festschr.' p. 81; id. 'Veröffentl.' ii, 27, 30).

¹ Zedler says ('Gutenberg-Forsch.' p. 117): 'The influence of the Schoeffer (!) type of the 31-line Indulgence on the Catholicon-type is unmistakable, only the latter, regarded as a whole, is an entirely independent (!) creation, etc.' (see my remarks on the Catholicon-type, in my 'Haarlem not Mentz,' p. 21). Again (in 'Veröffentl.' iii, 19), 'It certainly took Gutenberg many years of troublesome labour (!) to perfect not only the casting of types, but also a proper system of letters.'

The 'method' of minutely examining and describing types, their varieties and different forms, watermarks, quires, printers' habits, etc., which Dr. Schwenke thinks was initiated and perfected by Dziatzko, may bear some fruit. We have seen above (page 209) how Schwenke's own study of early types enabled him to realize that the 'Missale speciale' could not have been printed in the earliest period of Mainz printing, as it lacks the combinations of letters, and chief and secondary forms of letters, which are characteristic of that early time, but disappear gradually when the type-founders became a little more independent of manuscripts, and dispensed with combinations of letters which caused them more trouble than ordinary insulated forms.

But the 'method' is bound to cause, and is already causing, great confusion in bibliography, by ascribing two or more incunabula to one and the same printer, simply because there is some 'resemblance' between their types, marks of punctuation, paper, watermarks, the arrangement of quires, etc., as Dziatzko did with regard to B⁴² and B³⁶, while he also attributed the two Letters of Indulgence of 1454-5 to Gutenberg, merely because their small text types *resemble* each other. He even regarded an *x* which he had noticed in a Costerian 'Doctrinale,' as an 'imitation' of the 'Gutenberg' *x* found in B⁴² and B³⁶ (or of the *x* in the 1457 Psalter, he says), for no other reason than that he saw a resemblance between them.

Schwenke, Zedler, etc., also take a resemblance between types, etc., as their guide, and if they see

a 'likeness' between some of the letters, no differences in the shape and size of the others seem to prevent them from ascribing two or more founts to Gutenberg. These proceedings are disapproved of even in Germany; see 'Literar. Centralbl.' 1902, col. 1405. It is true that something similar is done with respect to the Costerian types, some of which are only linked to the others by a 'family-likeness.' But this family-likeness is not the mere 'resemblance' on the strength of which a number of otherwise dissimilar types are attributed to Gutenberg. The Costerian types stand apart from all others, and yet are linked among themselves, not only by a general striking likeness between them, but also by a characteristic *t* with a perpendicular stroke attached on the right-hand side to its cross-stroke; further, by a minute stroke connecting the signs of contraction with the letters over which they stand (see below, p. 298), and by an equally characteristic *r*, with a small stroke or curl, which are all imitations from indigenous handwritings. The so-called Gutenberg-type (that of B3⁶, a large Gothic or Church- or Missal-type), with its so-called 'phases,' cannot be called peculiar when it is used for Divine Service books, but its large size appears strange when used for a school-book (Donatus) or a Kalendar. In 1461, however, and later, this large type is employed by Albr. Pfister, at Bamberg, for a somewhat similar purpose—that is, a set of popular books. Hence, according to Dziatzko's 'Method,' the Paris Donatus, Weltgericht, Astronomical Kalendar, etc., should be attributed to Pfister, who printed other

books in a similar, if not the identical type, rather than to any other printer. But Schwenke and Zedler, by ascribing an earlier date to the Donatus, etc., separate them from the Pfister books, and ask us (1) to ascribe to Gutenberg three books, said to have been printed between 1443 and 1447, two in the earliest, the third in the second 'phase' of his type; (2) to believe that he printed all the others mentioned in the above list; and (3) that, in manufacturing his 'third' phase of this type (for B³⁶), which is described as a reproduction of the forms of the 'first' and 'second' phases, he 'roughly imitated' the type of B⁴², which materially differs from that of B³⁶.

If I do not misunderstand them, this is what the arguments of Schwenke and Zedler, based on the 'Dziatzko-Method,' come to, though the latter suggests some other theory as well (see above, p. 210). By thus basing themselves on a 'likeness' between types, they ascribe to Gutenberg a number of types and books (even one which bears the name of Peter Schoeffer in the colophon), because in these books they recognise, they say ('Veröffentl.' i, 49; 'Gutenberg-Forsch.' 76), the 'Gutenbergian' type, which means, from their point of view and according to their 'method,' not that there is any evidence that Gutenberg ever cast or used this type, but that they see in them some features ('simplicity' and the 'total absence of superfluous strokes') which they say are peculiar to Gutenberg.

Gutenberg is praised for his ingenuity and skill in cutting and casting the types of B⁴², but the scribe

whose manuscript was the model for the peculiarities and contrivances for effecting that symmetry and harmony which are admired in the types is hardly alluded to. Without disparaging the merits of the cutters and founders of the B³⁶ and B⁴² types or any other types, much greater praise is due to the scribes who produced the models for them long before the art of cutting and casting types was known, and who formed every letter they produced by hand.

Our three authors appear to have overlooked the late Will. Blades's 'Life and Typography of William Caxton,' published in two volumes in 1861, in which he discusses and exhibits, on the plates xi, xiii, xvi, xviii, xxi, xxiii, all the chief and secondary forms of the letters, and combinations of letters, ever cast and used by Caxton.

On page 31 of Vol. I. Blades explains that

'the first printer, when forming his alphabet, was never troubled as to the shape he should give his letters. The form which would naturally present itself to him would be that to which he and the people to whom he hoped to sell his productions had been accustomed. The types used in the first printed books closely resemble the written characters of the period, and this imitation was extended to all those combinations of letters which were then in use by the scribes. Thus the Psalters and Bibles which appeared in Germany, among the first productions of the press, were printed in the characters used by the scribes for ecclesiastical service books, while more general literature was printed in the common bastard-Roman. . . . Caxton's types bear the closest resemblance to the handwriting in the Mercers' books, and to the volumes of that era in the Archives of Guildhall.'

Blades repeated this in his 'Biography and Typography of W. Caxton,' published in 1877, and again in the second edition of this work published in 1882.

It is true, the printer of B4² worked some fifteen years earlier than Caxton, but he was not, on that account, more original than the latter, because Caxton and his contemporaries still followed that universal custom of the earlier printers (no matter whether we ascribe the origin of the moveable type to Haarlem or to Mainz) of Holland, Germany, Italy, France, etc., of imitating, when casting their types, as closely as possible, the handwriting indigenous to the region (province or town) where they settled. This imitation they extended, as Blades says, not merely to the size and forms of the letters (small or capitals), but to every other feature or characteristic of the letters, the ligatures, signs of contractions, etc., which they found in the manuscripts.

In the same way the Blockbooks and their pictures were nothing but imitations of contemporary manuscripts or those which had preceded them.

This imitation was likewise a matter of course and necessity for the Dutch inventor of printing with moveable metal types; it remained a matter of course and necessity for all the printers who came after him, at Mainz, Bamberg, Strassburg or any other place, and it may no less be observed in the gradual development and changes of the hand-writings anterior to printing, from the earliest period and from one generation to another, however

much the writings of one century or one locality may seem to differ from those of another.

After the appearance of Mr. Blades's book, my own researches led me to realize these facts independently, and I called attention to them in 'The Academy' of 11th October, 1884, in the 1888 edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (article 'Typography'), and more at length in my 'Haarlem not Mentz,' 1887, pp. 18-23.

Schwenke, therefore, when he said (see above, p. 208 *sq.*) that earlier authors on printing had hardly noticed any of 'Gutenberg's contrivances,' and that Dziatzko was *the first* to point out the differences between the chief and secondary forms of the letters, must have forgotten or overlooked what Blades and I had said as to MSS. having been the models for the earliest types. It is true, neither Blades nor I pursued the subject beyond general observations as to the printers having derived the forms of their types from the MSS. Consequently, I would not describe as superfluous a treatise on the 'contrivances' of the early printers, and the 'chief and secondary forms' of the earliest types. On the contrary, it might, as has been remarked above, be useful and necessary, provided such an enquiry is conducted with the full knowledge that the types are nothing but imitations from manuscripts, and that, therefore, the handwritings are the proper and ultimate bases for research and study of this interesting subject.

This imitation of handwritings by the earliest typefounders is clearly shown by what Zedler calls ('Veröffentl.' I., 34) a 'characteristic peculiarity' of

the types of the earlier Dutch Incunabula—namely, a small, thin, perpendicular stroke,¹ which connects the horizontal strokes or signs of contraction with the letters or types above which it appears. Several instances of it may be seen in his photograph of the Hague 31-line Donatus ('Veröffentl.' I., pl. iv.); exx. gr. 2nd page, li. 2 tamq̃; li. 3 q̃litis, li. 6 mecū, respōdēdi, etc. Zedler says that this connecting stroke

is not everywhere distinctly visible, though originally, no doubt, it was, as there are examples of each letter which has a stroke of contraction. The original of the Donatus, though it has suffered much, shows this better than even the facsimile. This peculiarity occurs in all the early Donatuses and other Incunabula figured in Holtrop's 'Monuments,'² and is a characteristic of the early typographically printed Dutch Incunabula, because nothing is seen of such a connecting stroke in the xylographically printed books. Whenever it is not visible in the Donatus-fragment, it is, no doubt, owing to the type, after

¹ To be precise, this connecting link or stroke is not always perpendicular, but often slanting, and comes down either from the right side of the mark of contraction (which is sometimes a horizontal, sometimes a wavy stroke, and often has the form of a semi-circle) on to the right side of the type, or from the left side of the horizontal stroke, on to the left side of the type. On the *o* and *a* it generally rests on the central point of these letters. In certain cases this link is nothing more than a small point.

² See his 10th (a xylographic Donatus) to 33rd plate, which all happen to be facsimiles of *Costeriana*, in the well-known Costerian types. On pl. 33^b only one or two instances occur. But we have it again on pl. 34 and 35 (Jacob Bellaert, Haarlem, 1483-4), though perhaps not on pl. 36 (Joh. Andreas, Haarlem, 1486). It does not occur in the *Utrecht* Incunabula figured on pl. 37, 38, 39, but Ger. Leempt's (*Utrecht*) type has it. It is also found on pl. 54, 56, 59 (Louvain), 60, 61 (Bruges), 82 (Delft), 90, 100 (Antwerp); see further plates 106, 110, 111, 113, 122.

casting, having been trimmed, whereby the connecting stroke, required by the nature of the stamp (patrix), was deliberately removed, as militating against the *written* form of the letter. This trimming was necessary, for instance, in the case of *i*, which otherwise would have been indistinct. But even the *i* shows traces of this link, as in *huic* (li. 29), *legenti* (li. 31). When we examine the contemporary Dutch manuscripts, we find nothing (!) analogous to this peculiarity of the printing-type. It would, indeed, be strange if this connecting stroke . . . was based on manuscript custom; it was rather required by the mode of manufacturing the type. The stamp used for the making of the matrix cannot have been a staff, on the lower part of which the letter was cut in an inverted order; it must have consisted of a mere letter without a bottom. Therefore, the material of which it was made was not wood, but metal, that is brass, &c., &c.

If Zedler, before he wrote this, had examined Dutch Blockbooks and Dutch Manuscripts, he would have seen that the peculiarity of which he speaks, far from being absent, is a special feature in them, in the same way as it is in the earliest Dutch Incunabula. It may be seen in nearly every line of the Xylographic pages of the 'Speculum humane Salvationis,' perhaps not everywhere so clearly as in the three or four typographic editions (Latin and Dutch) of this work, but still plainly enough to show that the woodcutter did his best to copy his manuscript model. It may also be seen in the Dutch Xylographic 'Canticum Canticorum' (see two instances on Plate 10 of Berjeau's edition), and in the Dutch edition of the 'Ars Moriendi'; see Cust's edition, Pl. I^a, or p. 40, 47, last line (*nūquā*), 49, second line, and traces of the

system on p. 57, li. 18, 20 (*quam, quantum*), and p. 59. It occurs likewise, not in any haphazard way, but as a regular system, in the Dutch Manuscripts. In July, 1908, I saw in the showcases of the Museum Meerman-Westreenianum at the Hague, five MSS. all having this peculiarity—namely, AA 123 (Latin Breviary, in the Netherlands, c. 1450); AA 187 (Nederl. Getijdenboek, in the Netherlands, 1489); AA 193 (Nederl. Psalter, in the Netherlands, c. 1450); AA 69 (Dietsche Doctrinaal, in the Netherlands, 1374). I saw it likewise in a richly illustrated 'Biblia Pauperum' of the fourteenth century preserved in the same museum.

It is, therefore, not surprising that it was imitated by the printer of the 'Costeriana.' Zedler discusses this point when dealing with some theories as to the more or less defective mode of manufacturing types supposed to have been adopted, as a necessity, by the Inventor of Printing at Haarlem, or by Gutenberg at Mainz (see 'Veröffentl.' i., 22 *sqq.*). One of these theories, advanced by Dziatsko in his treatise on B³⁶ and B⁴², would have it (Zedler, in 'Veröffentl.' i., 30, 47) that the signs of abbreviation, so numerous in early prints (in imitation of the MSS. and Blockbooks), were not cast on the same staff as the letter above which they appear, but separately, and were subsequently fixed, by some mechanism, over the letter. Schwenke ('Veröff.' ii., 5) opposes this theory, though he seems to accept it with regard to the letter *p*, with sign of contraction for 'pro,' in B³⁶, which Zedler ('Veröff.' i., 46) thinks consisted of two types. It seems unnecessary to discuss this theory here; it

militates against all that we see in the early German prints. Anyhow, as regards the Dutch incunabula, it is disposed of by the characteristic peculiarity described above. Another theory regarding the casting of the earliest type, which Zedler discusses at great length, was published a few years ago by the well-known type-founder Dr. Ch. Enschedé, of Haarlem. He called it the 'Abklatsch-Method,' and thought that Gutenberg was led to the invention of this method by seeing one of the earlier Dutch 'Donatuses.' By this method, according to Enschedé, after the patrices and matrices had been manufactured, the types were cast in two operations; first, the letter itself on a small plate, and then a small staff or shank added to it by means of a casting-form. I have dealt with this theory in my article 'Typography' in the 'Encycl. Britannica.' Suffice it to repeat here that the above peculiarity, which is so conspicuous in the early Dutch types (and also in the Dutch Blockbooks), is a faithful imitation of the same peculiarity in the Dutch handwritings, and for this reason cannot be attributed to any imperfect mechanism of the early Dutch typefounders.

To return to the B³⁶ and B⁴² types, there is nothing in them to lead us to think, or to assume, that the former was an imitation of the B⁴² type, or *vice versa*. Both are clearly independent imitations of two different but unmistakably 'Gothic' manuscripts. This script, which may also be called the ornamental Gothic or *Church-band*, has been employed for ages for Bibles, Missals, and other ecclesiastical books, and is fully developed in the B⁴²

and B³⁶ types. It begins to make its appearance in the tenth century, if not earlier, and runs its course till long after the invention of printing.¹ Its beginning, development, and perfection may be clearly traced by the facsimiles in the 3rd Volume of 'The (London) Palaeographical Society,' plates 32 (Charter of 966), 35 (Benedictional, c. 963-984), 54 (Bible, twelfth century), 60 (Bible, thirteenth century), 65 (Psalter, A.D. 1284, with fine strokes as in the Cambridge MSS. mentioned above), 67 (Somme le Roi, c. 1300), 72 (Psalter, early fourteenth century), 75 (Psalter, c. 1339), 78 (French Coronation Service, 1365), 86 (Horace, 1391), 95 (Burgundian Breviary, c. 1419), 100 (Psalter, 1442), 106 (Breviary, c. 1500). Also by facsimiles in the 2nd Volume of the same Society's Second Series, as 18 (1158), 20 (twelfth century), 23 (1218), 25-27 (1269, etc.), 29 (1322), 32 (1330), 42-44 (early fifteenth century), 48 (*id.*), 54 (1446),

¹ In the Cambridge University Library (pressmark Dd. 7. 1, 2) are two large folio volumes, the writing of which (ascribed in the Catalogue to the somewhat late date 1490) resembles the type of B⁴² so much, that at first sight one might mistake them for copies of this Bible. It has all the (primary and secondary) forms of letters, all the combinations of letters, and all the contractions above and through certain letters, which Dziatzko (*l. c.*) and Schwenke ('Festschrift') have selected from B³⁶ and B⁴², and figured in their texts and on separate plates. The capitals in these MSS. differ only slightly from those of B⁴², less than the latter differ from those of B³⁶. The small letters of the MSS. resemble in every respect those of B⁴², except that many letters of the former end in or begin with a fine stroke, which also does duty to mark the *i*. Generally speaking, the writing of these MSS. resembles the type of B⁴² much more than the B³⁵ type resembles that of B⁴². But would anyone ascribe these MSS. to 'Gutenberg' or to his 'school'?

63; Franz Steffens, III. 83 (fourteenth century), 87 (1404), 88 (1410), etc., all showing that the printers of B³⁶ and B⁴², in engraving and casting their types, exercised no 'inventive' or 'creating' genius, but merely imitated the writing of one or other of the manuscript Bibles or Missals, which were ready at their hands, in the same way as the block printers before them imitated handwritings in cutting their blocks for their texts and pictures. The MSS. referred to above, all written between circa 963 and 1500—that is, for the most part before Gutenberg's appearance as an artisan or a would-be printer—show the same 'contrivances' and the same 'chief and secondary forms' as the books ascribed to him. It is, therefore, not surprising that there is a 'resemblance' between the types of B⁴² and B³⁶, just as there is between the various scripts mentioned above. The capitals of the two types, however, differ materially from each other in form and size, and so do the small (lower-case) letters, the signs of interpunction, etc., though, perhaps, to a less extent. But we could hardly assume that for the latter the founder of the B³⁶ types took B⁴² as his model, when it is evident that for his *capitals* he must have had another (that is, a MS.) model.

On this ground alone we may safely treat B⁴² and B³⁶ as two separate works of two different printers.

Nor can the arrangement of the two Bibles in quires of the same number of (ten) sheets, nor their division into Volumes at the same place, nor the identity of paper and watermarks in both, be

taken as evidence that they were printed by one and the same printer, as the manuscript models of that period were similarly arranged. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the same kind of paper which was bought (at Mainz ?) by the printer of B⁴², was not purchasable at another place by another printer.

But even if all these resemblances and coincidences could be considered as evidence regarding the printer or printers of the two Bibles, on bibliographical grounds (already mentioned on p. 166 of my 'Gutenberg') we must attribute B⁴² to Peter Schoeffer.

He used the B⁴² type probably before 1457 (not long after B⁴² had been issued), in printing a 'Donatus' of 35 lines, which bears his name in the colophon: 'per Petrum de gernssheym, in urbe Moguntina cum suis capitalibus' (see II.^b, 7, of the above list, and my 'Gutenberg,' p. 171). The employment of these *capitals* in the Psalters of 1457 and 1459, in the colophons of which Fust and Schoeffer print their names, links them on to the 'Donatus.' Some authors contend that, as Schoeffer does not mention Fust in the colophon

¹ These last three words cannot mean 'with *its* capitals' (that is, of the Donatus), as some authors interpret them, but 'with *his* capitals,' that is, 'of (the printer) Peter de Gernssheym.' Schoeffer, in his colophons, repeatedly uses the somewhat analogous expression: '*suis* consignando scutis,' in the Iustinianus of 26th Jan., 1475, 23rd May, 1476, 21st Aug., 1477; the Bernardus of 14th April, 1475; the Clemens of 10th Sept., 1476; the Horborch of 4th Jan., 1477; the Paulus of 7th Jan., 1478; the Breslau Missal of 24th July, 1483. Here *suis* could not possibly be translated by *its*, or mean that the shields were the book's shields.

of the 'Donatus,' he must have printed it after Fust's death in 1466. But the sequence of Schoeffer's work, in connection with *his capitals*, is this:

1457-1466 he prints in partnership with Joh. Fust;
1467 he prints alone;

1457 and 1459 (August) he issues the Psalter with the capitals *printed* in colours;

1459 (Oct.) the Durandus, with the capitals *printed* (but in some copies only) in colours;

1460 the Clementinae without *printed* capitals;

1460-1489 *no printed* capitals in books;

1490 and 1502 the Psalter is reprinted, with the *printed* capitals (as an antiquarian reprint). No books are known after this date with printed capitals.

Seeing, therefore, that Gernsheim's *capitals* occur only in the first two dated books and some copies of the third, and in none of the subsequent books, except the merely antiquarian reprints of the Psalter in 1490 and 1502, it is more consonant to method to place the 'Donatus' before 1457, that is in 1456, together with B4² printed in the same type and probably issued the same year. For other Donatuses (of 26, 32 and 33 lines) printed in the same type, perhaps before that of 35 lines, see the above list and my 'Gutenberg,' p. 168 sqq.

For bibliographical reasons also, we must ascribe the 30-line Indulgence of 1454-5 to Peter Schoeffer. Its two headlines to the two forms of absolution (*Forma plenissime absolutionis*, etc.), and three or four other words (*Paulinus*; *Misereatur*, etc.) are printed, for the sake of distinction, in a (Church or Missal)

larger type than the bastard Roman type employed for its text. It is doubtful whether this large type is identical with that used for B4². It is known that the *P* of the Indulgence (in the word Paulinus) differs from the *P* in B4². I also fail to find the capital *F* of the Indulgence in any of Schwenke's facsimiles of B4² (in 'Festschrift'), or in his tables at pp. 32, 33. Even the *F*, which he gives (among the capitals in li. 3) as a later form in B4², differs from the Indulgence *F*, though its straight left top much resembles it.

Moreover, the semi-bows and slanting strokes above the *i*'s in the Indulgence¹ differ from those in (the first impressions of) B4², but less in the latter's final type, though it is hard to see how this final type could differ in *form* from its former two states (B4⁰ and B4¹), if we accept the fling-down theory. This Church-type would seem to have been specially cast for the 30-line Indulgence, just as the Church-type of the 31-line Indulgence seems to have been specially manufactured for this one document, as certain of its letters appear also to differ from the B3⁶ types.

And as neither of the small or brief-types used for the texts of these two Indulgences have been traced in any other work, it seems not unreasonable

¹ Long after this had been written, I noticed that Schwenke ('Festschrift,' p. 58) had already observed these differences. But when he says that he would ascribe the Indulgence type to the founder of that of B4² on account of the *similarity* between the two, I cannot agree with him. A similarity between types is no evidence; I ascribe the two types to Schoeffer on bibliographical grounds.

to suppose that the four kinds of types employed for these two broadsides were exclusively cut and cast for them, and, for some reason or another, discarded afterwards. Anyhow, on bibliographical grounds, it is certain that Peter Schoeffer printed the 30-line Indulgence, as the initial M of its *first* absolution is identical with the initial M of the *second* absolution in a 33-line Indulgence unquestionably printed by him and issued in 1489, at the order of Pope Innocent VIII., by 'Raymundus Peyraudi archidiaconus Alnisiensis in ecclesia Xanton pro tuicione orthodoxe fidei contra Turchos' (copies of which are in the British Museum, and the Culemann collection at Hanover; see my 'Gutenberg,' p. 166). Therefore, whether we regard the Church-type used in the 30-line Indulgence as identical with that of B42 or not, the printing of the document must be ascribed to Peter Schoeffer.

And hence, if bibliographical rules and documentary evidence carry any weight, B42 and the books printed in the same type, together with the 30-line Indulgence and its two types (all mentioned in List B), must be attributed to Peter Schoeffer, and not to Gutenberg or any other printer.

As regards the types and books in the above List A, our course is not so clear as with the books in List B; firstly, it is not easy to examine the types of the 'Weltgericht,' and the Paris 'Donatus,' as the photographs of them, published by the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, are none too clear, probably because the condition of the documents is unfavourable to photographic action. Secondly,

that of the 'Donatus' is reduced in size, so that we can neither measure nor minutely examine its types. Thirdly, the text of the 'Donatus' is in Latin, that of the 'Weltgericht' (of which no more than 22 lines are preserved) in German, which latter language requires some letters, combination of letters, contractions, etc., which are never or rarely employed in a Latin book, and *vice versa*. However, the similarity between the forms and size of their types may easily lead bibliographers to consider them identical. Zedler draws attention ('Veröffentl.' iii., p. 10 *sqq.*) to two *i*'s and two *b*'s, which slightly differ in form, but all occur, he says, in the 'Weltgericht' as well as in the 'Donatus,' wherefore he thinks that the two works are printed in one and the same type. He likewise minutely describes (*ibid.*, p. 13 *sqq.*, i., 16) seven different *i*'s, all observed by him in the 'Weltgericht,' the 'Donatus,' the Astronomical Kalendar, the Turk-kalendar, the Laxier-kalendar, etc. For the seventh, he says, Gutenberg had made a *special matrix*, and four of the *i*'s he regards as 'developments' (therefore, not as 'identical') of the type (p. 14), while he takes the differences between them as a guide to the chronological order to be assigned to the books attributed to Gutenberg.

It has already been remarked above (p. 201) that, if the Helmasperger document is genuine, Gutenberg could not have begun to print before 1450, as in that year he, by his own admission, borrowed money, not for 'printing' anything, but for 'making tools' or an 'apparatus.' The authors of the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, however, contend

that Gutenberg intended to prepare these 'tools' for B42, but that he had already printed various works before 1450. They place the 'Weltgericht' c. 1443, the Paris 'Donatus' before 1444 or shortly after, and the Astronomical Kalendar at the end of 1447, and profess to prove that the first two books are in the 'first phase,' the third in the 'second phase' of Gutenberg's oldest type. But it is difficult to accept these assertions, as the contraction for *us* (9), the dots, small horizontal marks and bows over the *i*'s and the *V* (used as *U* and *V*) in the 'Donatus,' when compared with the same signs or letters in the Astronomical Kalendar, make it clear that the types of these two works differ from each other, and that, though *resembling* each other, they cannot, on account of small but material differences in form and size, be described as two 'phases' or 'developments' of one and the same type. And types materially differing from each other in form and size cannot have been cast from the same patrices and matrices. In this case the differences can be attributed neither to the worn-out condition of the 'Donatus' (see 'Veröffentl.' i., 16), nor to the freshness of the Kalendar-type. For instance: the contraction for *us* (9) in the Kalendar cannot have been cast from the patrix and matrix used for manufacturing the same sign for the 'Donatus,' as the former is longer and thinner than that of the 'Donatus,' and has a more angular top than the latter, which is perfectly round (°). Nor could the *i*'s of the Kalendar, with dots or small horizontal marks or bows at a material distance from their top, have been cast

from the patrices and matrices used for the *i*'s or the 'Donatus,' which have these marks much closer to their top.

Another feature in the evidence of Schwenke ('Centralbl.', 1901, p. 290 *sqq.*) and Zedler is a tall *t* in the Turk-kalendar for 1455, which is preceded, in all words where two *t*'s come together, by an ordinary shorter *t*; *exx.gr.* 'bittern' (Wyss' ed., Taf. 31^a, li. 6); gelitten . . . erstritten (*ibid.*, li. 8), and various other words (*ibid.*, Taf. 31^b, li. 15; 32^a, li. 13; 32^b, li. 17, etc.). The second *t* overtops the first *t*, and its left side is straight, apparently so made that it might not interfere with the crossbar of the first. In some cases the two *t*'s seem to form a ligature (Taf. 31^a, li. 8, erstritten), but in the majority of cases they are disconnected, and do not always range in the line; cf. mittage (31^b, li. 15), dritte (32^a, li. 13).

Both authors point to a somewhat similar *t* in the Paris 'Donatus,' exclusively preceded by *c*, though the two do not seem to be a ligature; see Zedler's Facs., in 'Veröffentl.' i., Taf. II.^a, li. 4 (produ~~ct~~ta), 6 (produ~~ct~~am), 9 (Ac~~ti~~ua), 11 (ac~~ti~~ua), and in other words (*ibid.*, li. 12, 14, 16, 24, 25; Taf. III.^b, li. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, etc.). But the lengthened *t* of the Turk-kalendar cannot typographically be called a 'phase' or a 'development' of the lengthened *t* of the 'Donatus,' as the two differ in form and size; nor can the two *t*'s have been cast from the same matrix, that of the Turk-kalendar being larger than that of the 'Donatus.' It is to be observed that there is no trace of this peculiar *t* in the Astronomical Kalendar, though there were

occasions for using it, as in mittage (2nd February); dritten . . . mittage (1st April).

An examination of the types of the 'Weltgericht' is more difficult, as we have only a small portion (recto and verso) of one leaf. Each side contains no more than eleven lines, of which the first are slightly cropped by the binder. Ten lines measure 8.1 cm. ($=8\frac{1}{10}$ mm. to a line); or 8.2 cm. from the foot of the upper (truncated) line. The facsimiles of the Paris 'Donatus' being on a reduced scale, the height or the width of the lines cannot be measured. But ten lines (of January) of the Astron. Kalendar measure 8.3 cm.; of March and April, 8.2 cm.

Some of the letters in both documents, as *h*, *g*, *l*, especially the bows on the letter *i*, also show that those of the 'Weltgericht' differ from those in the 'Donatus.' Therefore, if these differences, observable in the photographs, do exist in the originals, then the 'Weltgericht,' the Paris 'Donatus,' the Astronomical Kalendar, and the Turk-kalendar of 1455, are printed in four different types, which may have been used or manufactured by one and the same printer, but are not, and cannot be called, phases of one and the same type, or developments of one original type.

The above List A shows that (apart from the types and books in List B) six types (I., II., V., VI., VII., VIII.) are attributed to Gutenberg, and about four-and-twenty different works, not to mention the 'many experiments' which, according to Zedler, must have preceded Gutenberg's 'masterly' printed Kalendar of 1447, nor the 'many

experiments' which, according to Schwenke, must have preceded B⁴². Of type I. (called sometimes the 'Gutenberg,' sometimes the B³⁶ type), three 'phases' or 'varieties' (i^a, i^b and i^c) are said to exist. For reasons stated above, however, they cannot be taken as such, as they are really three different types, and must, therefore, from a bibliographical and typographical point of view, be kept separate, even if the differences between them were smaller than they really are. Moreover, in the absence of all evidence of their having been used by one and the same printer, they must be ascribed to three different printers. Zedler tells us, that Alb. Pfister bought the B³⁶ type from Gutenberg at a high price, continued to use it at Mainz, and had afterwards, while still there, a new fount made of it (by Gutenberg), with certain patrices and matrices modified. But there is no authority for this assertion, which is, moreover, incompatible with the Helmasperger document. Hence, after ascribing, on clear bibliographical evidence, B⁴², and the eight other works of List B, to Peter Schoeffer, Gutenberg would still be credited with having manufactured no fewer than *eight*¹ different types (i. the 'Donatus' type; ii. the 'Kalendar' type; iii. the

¹ Zedler ('Veröffentl.' i., Taf. XIII.) gives tracings of *seven* different 'phases' of the oldest (!) Gutenberg-type (i. the 'Donatus' type; ii^a, the 'Kalendar' type; ii^b, the 'Turk-kalendar' type; ii^c, the 'Cisianus' type; ii^d, the Laxierkalendar type; ii^e, the London 27-line 'Donatus' type; iii. the B³⁶ type). If now we add to these seven the two types of the 31-line Indulgence, the two of the Psalter and that of the 'Catholicon,' Gutenberg is credited with *twelve* types, not to speak of the three ascribed above on safe grounds to Schoeffer.

Church type and iv. the text type of the 31-line Indulgence; v. the B³⁶ type; vi. and vii., the large and small types of the Psalter of 1457; viii. the Catholicon type), and with having printed at least twenty-four different works, including a large folio Bible (B³⁶) in two volumes, the large folio 'Catholicon' and other important works. Schwenke, indeed, thinks that some unknown printer printed B³⁶, but—in Gutenberg's printing office.

J. H. HESSELS.

(To be continued.)

FISHER'S SERMON AGAINST LUTHER.

IN the Auction Catalogue of books belonging to the late Professor S. H. Butcher, M.P., sold at Cambridge the 25th of May, 1911, was this item:

‘Fysher’s Sermon against Luther, Wynkyn de Worde, black-letter, n.d., 4to, morocco.’

I did not see the copy until the day before the sale. On examination I found it to be imperfect, and that it was included with other lots of books, which formerly belonged to the late Professor John E. B. Mayor, whose library was sold at Cambridge in March previously.

That evening I looked up various authorities, and found in Mr. E. Gordon Duff’s list of Wynkyn de Worde’s books (in ‘Handlists of English Printers,’ part i., 1895) amongst the ‘Undated books, 1501-1535,’ the following:

Fisher against Luther	4to. B. M.
Fisher aganist Luther	4to. B. M.

Consulting library catalogues I then found that the Cambridge University Library possessed a copy in the Samuel Sandars Collection, The entries in the

British Museum Catalogue state that their two copies varied. In the Cambridge University Library Catalogue (I. 49) 'B. M. 524' is placed against their copy.

Whilst examining the other lots in this sale I came across a portfolio of odds and ends, and in it found some facsimiles which I thought were of the same work.

At the sale I purchased the Sermon of Bishop Fisher, and also the portfolio of odds and ends.

Examining the Sermon I was puzzled to find it agreed with no description of the work as printed by Wynkyn de Worde. I had the description (1) of the two editions in the British Museum Catalogue, where two varying issues are given, and (2) of the copy in the Cambridge University Library Catalogue.

The title given in the Cambridge University Library Catalogue differed from the first one mentioned in the British Museum Catalogue, and I therefore concluded that the Cambridge copy was the 'another edition' mentioned in the British Museum Catalogue.

Then remembering the portfolio of odds and ends, I secured a copy of the facsimile contained therein, and, to my surprise, found it agreed with neither of the copies whose titles were given in the two catalogues mentioned, by reason of the variances of the letterpress. And as I could see through the facsimile part of the British Museum stamp at the back of the title-page, I concluded that it was a facsimile of the 'another edition' mentioned in their catalogue. This left the issues thus:

1. The edition described in the British Museum Catalogue.
2. The 'other edition' in the British Museum Catalogue, represented by the photographic facsimile I possessed.
3. The copy in the Cambridge University Library.

The copy in the Cambridge University Library agrees more with No. 1, with the following variances:

B. M. again doctryn assygnement. Cardynal.
 C. U. L. agayn doctryne assingnement. Cardinal.

But all this did not help to identify my copy, and I was intending to write to someone at the British Museum about it, when I casually looked up my own Index to Hazlitt's Collections and Notes, noted one reference to Fisher's Sermon, looked it up, and found to my great surprise the title-page of my copy accurately given from Herbert's Ames, and with the imprint of Thomas Berthelet! I looked in Herbert's Ames, and found the description there given, agreeing with my copy, was taken from a copy in Herbert's possession.

Failing to find a copy described I turned to Mr. W. W. Greg's list of Berthelet's 'Undated Books' (in 'Handlists of English Printers,' part iii., 1905), and found

'Fisher. Sermon at St. Paul's, 11 Feb. 1525.
 1529(?) 4to. Bodl.'

The date 11 Feb. 1525 does not appear on the Sermon.

As this was the only copy I could find, I wrote to Mr. F. Madan, at the Bodleian, giving a few rough notes, and he kindly answered, giving me a 'test' which I found differed in my copy. I may say now that the Bodleian copy formerly belonged to Herbert.

I then sent the copy to him for examination, and his reply (3rd of June) is, 'They are different issues. . . . Every sheet differs in small details, and I think yours is the earlier,' and then quoted certain variances from which could be drawn the conclusion that mine is the earlier issue. Also, of the four different border-pieces round the title-page, the one used at the top of my issue is used at the foot of the Bodleian copy, and the bottom block in mine is at the top of the Bodleian copy. A few variances noted are:

	MINE.	BODLEIAN.
A 3 ^r 9th l. from foot	saint	saynt
B 4 ^r 12th l. from foot	secōde . . . muste	seconde . . . must
G 3 ^v l. 16	sowerh	soweth

The Bodleian copy consists of signatures A-H⁺; mine consists of A-F⁺, Gⁱⁱ & iii. Gⁱ & iv and H are wanting.

Such is the hunt I have had to fix the edition of the work so casually purchased, sent in the wrong direction by the lettering of the volume, where it is definitely stated, 'Wynkyn de Worde.' The copy has all the appearance of having been found in the binding of some book, and has been most skilfully mended, and bound by F. Bedford. The

318 SERMON AGAINST LUTHER.

autograph of 'John S. Wood, A.D. 1879' appears on the end-paper. I think Spicer Wood was Librarian of St. John's College, Cambridge, and he it was, no doubt, who had the work bound. It is a great pity he did not place on record where these sheets came from.

The result of this interesting hunt can be summed up as follows:

- (1) Instead of two undated issues of Fisher's Sermon printed by Wynkyn de Worde, we have three—two at the British Museum and one at the Cambridge University Library—all unique.
- (2) Instead of one undated issue printed by Thomas Berthelet, we have two—one at the Bodleian, and one (imperfect) not yet placed—both unique.

With regard to the date of printing (1529?) in Mr. Greg's list, I should like to know when this Sermon was preached. In the article on Fisher in the D. N. B. is the statement: 'He preached in the vernacular, before Wolsey and Warham, at Paul's Cross, on the occasion of the burning of the reformer's writings in the churchyard (12 May, 1521), a discourse which was severely handled by William Tyndale.' The title of the Sermon says it was preached on Quinquagesima Sunday. This could not have been in May. Is the D. N. B. right, and, if so, does it refer to this or to another Sermon of Fisher's against Luther?

G. J. GRAY.

‘THE ATHEIST CONVERTED.’

THE FIRST BOOK PRINTED IN LINCOLN.

THE ATHEIST CONVERTED’ is one of the quaintest productions of the journeymen poets whose rhymes amused or instructed our forefathers in ballads or chap-books. The earliest known edition, a duodecimo of twelve pages, is also notable because, so far as has been ascertained, it is the first effort of the press in the city or Lincoln, in whose Public Library a copy is preserved.

As was then the fashion the title-page furnishes an ample bill of fare, and reads :

‘The/Atheist/Converted/or/The Unbeliever’s/Eyes
open’d./Being/A full and true Account of one Mr.
Wright, a Gentle-/man, living in the Island of Guernsey,
who was/a profest Atheist, and would not suffer his
children to go to/to Church, and how he was converted
by his little/Daughter of ten Years of Age./The following
is the text of his Funeral sermon preach’d/by the Rev.
Dr. Dry. from Psalm the 50th, Ver. 14./I will teach thy
ways to the Unjust, and the Wicked shall/be converted
to thee./Lincoln:/Printed and sold by W. Wood./In
the Year MDCCXLVIII.’

There is a copy of a much later edition in Harvard University Library, in which the preacher

has the less allegorical style of 'The Rev. Dr. Jones.'

The Lincoln booklet is a curiosity. In doggerel rhymes we are told that one Sunday as the congregations were returning from the services,

'Unto her Father thus the child did say,
Why dy (sic) these People go to Church I pray?
Why will you not let me go in to see
What they do there? I'd fain a Christian be.
With threatening words the Father did reply,
The moment you go there you sure shall die,
Such superstitious Folly I disdain.
For I know that all things by Nature came.'

The story is divided into six parts, and supplied with prose arguments. Thus: 'Part Second. How the child being disturb'd in her Mind went wandering in the Fields, where seeing the Flowers springing, and the birds singing she consulted (sic) there must be a God, tho' her Father told her to the contrary.'

Then an angel appears, and directs her to go to a village where a pious family would care for her religious education.

'Part Third. How this Child as she was reading the 27th of St. Matthew's Gospel mediating (sic) on our Saviour's Passion her Father came to her and tore the Book out of her Hand and beat her in a most cruel Manner, and turn'd her out of door. Part Four. How the Devil appeared to the Child, proffering her two purses of Guineas to curse her Father and take his Council, but the Child instead of accepting the golden Bate (sic), instantly fell down on her knees to pray. Part

Fifth. Shewing how her Father confin’d her in a Garrat, allowed her nothing to live on but Bread and Water. Part Sixth. Shewing how the Ghost of the eldest son appeared to his Father, and declared to him the ‘Torments of Hell.’ This Dantean vision affected Mr. Wright’s conversion, and

‘None but the Child must his companion be,
They spent their time in Prayer constantly;
In three Months time her Father sick then fell,
And bid this sinful World indeed farewell.

‘Two thousand Pounds he left his Daughter fair,
Who, tho’ she’s young in tender years,
Is very charitable to the Poor,
Her daily thirst is after heavenly store.’

So ends this remarkable ‘poem,’ which is decorated by seven woodcuts which, as usual in chap-books, seem to have little connection with the text they are supposed to illustrate.

There is another edition, printed about 1790, in which some curious changes have been made in the title, which reads:

‘The Atheist converted; or the Unbeliever’s Eyes opened. Giving a full and true Account of one Mr. Wright, a gentleman at Liverpool in Lancashire, who was a professed Atheist, and would not let his children go to Church, told them all things came by Nature. How an angel appeared to his daughter about ten years of age, telling her to go to a family at the next village, who would instruct her in the Scriptures. How her father finds her in the garden with a little book in her hand at prayer, banish’d her from his house. She was sitting in a Grove. The devil came in human shape,

322 'THE ATHEIST CONVERTED.'

tempting her to curse her Father, and he would give her a purse of Gold. How she resisted the temptation, and converted him to Christianity. Being proper to be had by all families.

'Price one Penny: or given for Linen.'

It will be seen that Mr. Wright has removed his residence from the island of Guernsey to the populous and prosperous city of Liverpool.' There is a copy of the Liverpool story in the British Museum (Pressmark: 1075. l. 25/4). Mr. Wright suffered a further translation and removal back to the Channel Islands, as will be seen by this entry of a Welsh version in the catalogue of the British Museum (Pressmark: 872. d. 52/3):

'Troedigaeth yr Atheist, neu lygaid yr anghredadyn wedi ei hagog. Gan roddi . . . hanes un Mr. Wright . . . yr hwn oedd yn bwy'n Nhref Guernsey . . . Trefriw (1820). 12° pp. 8.'

We may now leave 'The Atheist Converted' in the peaceful recesses of his island home.

WILLIAM E. A. AXON.

'A notice of this edition appeared in the 'Liverpool Daily Post,' 17th April, 1911.

THE RED PRINTING IN THE 1611 BIBLE.

THE article by Mr. Horace Hart on 'The Red Printing in the 1611 Bible,' in the April number of the 'LIBRARY,' is of great interest to all those bibliographers who care for an exact knowledge of how the early printers worked, but, rash as it may seem to differ from so great an authority on practical printing, I venture to question whether he has not in certain respects been too much influenced by his familiarity with modern methods of work. Little seems to have been written about red printing in the seventeenth century, but there has been a certain amount of discussion of the methods followed at a somewhat earlier date, and there is now, I believe, little difference of opinion regarding them.¹ I wish to suggest that the printer of the 1611 Bible worked on exactly the same lines as his predecessors.

The usual process of printing in red and black

¹ At any rate as regards the second half of the sixteenth century. The process is described in Mr. Robert Steele's 'Earliest English Music Printing,' 1903, pp. 4-5. There is considerable doubt as to how some of the earliest printing in two or more colours was done; cf. R. M. Burch, 'Colour Printing,' 1910, pp. 4-6.

during the sixteenth century seems to have been as follows: ¹

1. The printer set up and proved the whole forme, red and black together.

2. He then cut out a frisket so as to allow only the red to print.² The soft packing used in the tympan would drive the paper down sufficiently to allow it to reach the type through the holes in the frisket. ³

¹ Leaving out of account the possibility of the forme having sometimes been dissected according to the method most commonly employed now-a-days. It has been stated that this method was also used, but the evidence for it does not seem to be conclusive. Irregularities in the casting of the type and in the furniture would, one might suppose, have made it difficult to obtain perfect register from two formes.

² A number of frisket sheets used in printing certain sixteenth century service-books were found some years ago by Mr. Robert Steele. I am indebted to Mr. R. A. Peddie for showing me one of them now in the Technical Library of the St. Bride's Foundation. From their condition Mr. Steele infers that the printer inked the whole forme with red ink, not merely the immediate neighbourhood of the red words, as one might have supposed. The method seems wasteful of ink, besides being very messy, and one would have expected the ink to creep along the edges of the frisket holes and impress the outline of them on the paper, unless, indeed, ink was used which dried extremely quickly. More might perhaps be learnt from these frisket sheets if the work in the production of which they were used could be identified. Of a suggested alternative method—namely, inking through a similarly cut stencil or mask—I have seen no evidence, but as the inking was done by balls, it might have been a workable plan, and there would have been no difficulty in devising an attachment so that such a stencil could be quickly placed in position for each inking.

³ It may be remarked that the underlaying method described by Mr. Hart necessitates the paper being driven down at least as much, for otherwise how did the rules, etc., which were not underlayed, contrive to print?

3. The red having been printed, the forme was cleaned and the portions that had been printed in red were taken out, and the spaces left by them were filled with quads. The frisket was also removed.

4. What was left of the forme was then inked with black ink, and the sheets were run through again.

The points of difference in the method described by Mr. Hart are: (1) That, according to him, the black was printed first; (2) that underlays were used to bring up first the black and then the red above type height; (3) that the red portions remained in the forme throughout the whole process.

To take these in their order. Whether the red or the black was printed first can often be determined by examination, for unless the register is quite perfect it will usually be found that here and there one ink is on the top of the other. In the case of many sixteenth century books it is quite clear that the black ink is on the top of the red, and that the red, therefore, must have been printed first.¹ I believe that if Mr. Hart will have another look at the 1611 Bible he will find that this is the case there also. In a copy which I have examined at the British Museum the black seems to be quite clearly on the top, and Dr. Greg tells me that the same is true of a copy which he has examined at Cambridge.

¹ I have not come across any book in which the black appears to have been printed first; but, of course, if a forme was to be principally in red, with only a few black words here and there, one would expect the usual order to be reversed.

That underlaying was not *necessary* may be seen by inspection of some of the folio Bibles printed by Barker towards the end of the sixteenth century.¹ These have a woodcut border to the title and, at the end of the preliminary matter, a full-page woodcut of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Parts of both these woodcuts, such as the royal emblems and the hair of the *putti* in the corners of the title-page, and the faces of the lions, etc., in the Garden of Eden, are printed both in red and black. The slight error in register causes the red lines to appear alongside the black, producing a peculiar brown or bronze-like effect. In this case underlaying was obviously impossible, for the parts printed in red and black are on the same block as those printed in black alone, and, therefore, cannot have been raised above the general level. Underlaying is a troublesome process, and if the printer could do without it in this case, why not in others?

That the red portions were removed after the first printing seems to me to be deducible from a careful examination of the calendar of almost any red and black Bible of the time—including that of 1611. When horizontal rules print accidentally both in red and black, it will, I think, almost always be found that, on any one page, the red lines are either all above or all below the black ones, showing that the arrangement of the forme

¹ I may refer to the one dated 1591. This has the interesting peculiarity that in the heading of August in the calendar the month was first stated (in red) to have xxx. days. In the black printing a j was printed over the full-stop of the xxx.

has not been disturbed vertically. In the case of vertical rules printing in both colours, however, we very frequently find that the red line appears sometimes to the right and sometimes to the left of the black one,¹ showing that there has been some lateral disturbance of the forme between the two printings. Now, surely, this is just what would happen if the red words or letters had been taken out, and the quads, or spaces, inserted to fill up the room of each had not exactly done so²; and otherwise it seems difficult to account for. Further, the red portions seem never to be partially duplicated in black ink, as the black portions are in red. If they remained in the forme during the whole process it is not easy to understand this, especially as these red portions are generally surrounded by black, and the use of a frisket to prevent them from printing is therefore out of the question.

R. B. MCKERROW.

¹ Even when on any one page all the red lines appear on the same side of the black ones, the space between them will generally be found to vary considerably.

² If, I mean, in filling up the spaces left by two or more red words in a line the printer had put rather too much in one space and too little in another, so that the intervening portions of the line were moved to left or right. Of course the *total* amount inserted would have had to be equal to the total length of the words removed.

REVIEWS.

The Golden-Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan, formerly known as the Hamilton Gospels and sometimes as King Henry the VIII.'s Gospels. Now edited for the first time with critical introduction and notes, and accompanied by four full-page facsimiles. By H. C. Hoskier. New York. Privately printed. 1910. Folio. pp. cxvi., 363.

THIS handsome book owes its origin to an offer by Mr. Hoskier to collate, for the Commission (presided over by Abbot Gasquet) for re-establishing the true text of S. Jerome's translation of the Gospels, a fine manuscript now in the possession of Mr. J. P. Morgan. The manuscript is written in letters of gold on purple vellum, and was undoubtedly prepared for presentation to some person of rank, or some other very special purpose. It belonged at one time to Henry VIII., but found its way into the Duke of Hamilton's collection, was purchased with other Hamilton manuscripts *en bloc* by the German Government, resold and bought by Quaritch, who found a customer for it in an American collector, from whom it passed, like so many other fine books, to Mr. Morgan's library. Mr. Hoskier's collation is now printed with an elaborate introduction and four plates, two of them reproducing the purple and gold of the original.

In his collation Mr. Hoskier has not confined himself to indicating how the Morgan manuscript differs from the Clementine text. He has collated also the texts, published or unpublished, of a number of other manuscripts of the Gospels, and has drawn up tables to show with which group of manuscripts that of Mr. Morgan agrees, and in respect to which readings. As soon as collation is carried to this point the way is cleared for very fascinating, but at the same time very hazardous, inferences as to the history and genealogy of the manuscript according to the combinations of different readings which it contains. The drawing of inferences from these combinations must be reckoned as hazardous, because every scribe who copied an existing text of the Gospels probably knew the Latin pretty well by heart in some text on which he had been brought up, and the extent to which the text which he had in his head may have caused him to modify the text which he was copying defies all calculation. The longer the pedigree which it is sought to assign to any manuscript the more these uncertainties must be multiplied by each other, so that the compilation of a genealogical tree, such as Mr. Hoskier bravely constructs, seems to us more interesting than convincing. Such small experience as the present writer has gained in dealing with Chaucer texts has inspired him with a profound distrust of all genealogies. The earliest extant Chaucer manuscripts must date from only a very few years after the poet's death, and yet they present problems which so far have defied

solution. Of course scribes would approach the copying of the Gospels with much more reverence than Chaucer's copyists, from Adam Scrivener downwards, seem to have felt for his verses. But what we may call their external or independent knowledge of the text would be much closer, and this, with the substitution of centuries for decades in the length of the pedigree, fills us with distrust. It is only fair to Mr. Hoskier to note that he repudiates the mechanical use of test passages; nevertheless the pedigree in which he traces his manuscript to a 'parent' written under Graeco-Syriac influences about 200 A.D., and suggests, with approximate dates, the influences by which it was subsequently affected, seems to run far in advance of safe deduction.

In another respect his introduction appears hardly likely to win assent. In a life of S. Wilfred, Archbishop of York (*d.* 709) there is an account of how he caused a manuscript to be written in letters of gold on purple vellum and gorgeously bound, and the theory had long ago been put forward by Wattenbach that these Hamilton-Morgan Gospels might be identified with this manuscript written by S. Wilfred's order. The theory has not won acceptance, and Mr. Hoskier himself can hardly be said to support it whole-heartedly. Nevertheless, he has allowed himself to be fascinated by the possibility. In this connection we must refer, also, to his startling contention that the manuscript was the work of some forty different scribes, 'a whole monastery.' That every brother in a monastery should be so skilled a calligrapher as to be entrusted

with the task of writing on purple vellum in letters of gold is a large assumption; but the idea of a Gospel-book in which every brother had borne his part certainly catches the imagination. Had the book, indeed, really been so written, we may be pretty sure that S. Wilfred's biographer would have told so edifying a tale. Mr. Hoskier was at one time inclined to account for this hypothetical division of labour by the rather prosaic theory that S. Wilfred wanted the manuscript in a hurry to take as a present to Rome, but he withdraws this suggestion in a footnote.

The Hamilton-Morgan manuscript is undoubtedly an important one. Mr. Hoskier appears to have made his collation with commendable care. His theories as to the pedigree of the manuscript, its date, and the manner in which it was written show pleasing enthusiasm. But they are certainly a little rash.

Shakespeare Bibliography: a dictionary of every known issue of the writings of our national poet and of recorded opinion thereon in the English language. By William Jaggard. With historical introduction, facsimiles, portraits, and other illustrations. Stratford on Avon, at the Shakespeare Press, in Sheep Street, MCMXI. pp. xxi. 729. Price Three Guineas.

How best to arrange the great mass of material which he has here brought together must have caused Mr. Jaggard much anxious thought, and

there is not much profit to be gained from any elaborate demonstration of how and why we should have disposed it differently. Since the heading 'Shakespeare' occupies very nearly half the book, we should have preferred to see it raised to the dignity of a separate section; nor do we like the interruption of the sequence of Shakespeare's plays by such entries as 'Cupid's Cabinet Unlocked,' 'Double Falsehood,' 'Fifth of November,' etc., nor the burial of useful Concordances and Glossaries among elegant extracts and 'Tales from Shakespeare.' We are also sorry that Mr. Jaggard transliterates upper-case V in the middle of words by v instead of u, that he writes 'Shakespearean' instead of 'Shakespearian' (why not Gladstonean, or Swinburnean?), and that he has thought it consonant with the respect due to his subject to let off some very small squibs in order to annoy a distinguished living scholar. Having satisfied our critical conscience with these remarks we are left free to express our admiration for an immensely laborious and immensely useful piece of work. If space and time were at our disposal, it would be easy to extract from Mr. Jaggard's seven hundred and fifty closely printed pages a whole series of articles which only gross lack of skill could fail to make interesting. We might trace from them the growth of Shakespeare's fame, compare the popularity of different plays, note the first appearance of the Shakespeare collector and the ever-increasing liberality of his bids, discourse on the various attempts to add to the 'canon' of Shakespeare's plays as set forth in the Folio of 1623, and the

small success with which they have met, or moralize on the vagaries of his critics, and the follies, forgeries, and frauds by which the mere fool, the conceited fool, and the dishonest fool have all tried to make their private profit out of his fame. A bibliography as thorough as this is inevitably a new starting-point as well as a record. The amount which has been written about Shakespeare is so vast that even the special student of any one section of it may be thankful for the guide here provided to what has been written on this, and the material which has to be reckoned with. The present writer is bound to confess, damaging as it may be, that he has learnt for the first time from Mr. Jaggard of the existence of seventeenth-century transcripts, preserved at Warwick Castle, of 'Julius Cæsar,' and the 'Merry Wives of Windsor,' besides that of 'Henry IV.,' published in the last volume of the old Shakespeare Society. A smaller piece of ignorance now relieved is that the British Museum copy of the first quarto of 'Hamlet' was sold to a Dublin bookseller by an undergraduate at Trinity College for a shilling. The grass should not grow green on the grave of this bookseller, who knew what he was about, since he sold the book to Boone for £70, and might have given the lad a sovereign. A (to him) new fact of another kind which has caught the writer's eye is that Authority continued to look with disfavour on 'King Richard II.' long after the days of the Earl of Essex, Nahum. Tate's version, though prepared under the name of 'The Sicilian Usurper,' having been prohibited in 1681 under

Charles II., and stopped after two representations in 1691 under William III.! To produce 'Richard II.' as 'The Sicilian Usurper' indicated an ill conscience which almost invited prohibition, but Authority was clearly sensitive, as Cibber's well-known version of 'King Richard III.', which held the stage for a century in preference to Shakespeare's, had for several years to be produced shorn of its first act, lest the misfortunes of Henry VI. should arouse sympathy for the exiled King James.

Other notes by Mr. Jaggard recall the struggle, about 1734, between Jacob Tonson, who claimed the copyright of Shakespeare's Works, and 'R. Walker and his accomplices,' who infringed it, and maintained that their editions followed 'the copies made use of at the theatre,' whereupon Tonson procured and printed a statement from the prompter at Drury Lane that 'no person ever had, directly or indirectly, from me any such copy or copies, neither would I be accessory on any account to imposing on the publick such useless, pirated, and maimed editions.' This notice occurs in an edition of the 'Comedies of Errors,' and in the same year we find Tonson publishing the 'Merry Wives of Windsor' at a penny to undersell Walker, who was offering it for fourpence. But we are beginning to pick out plums from Mr. Jaggard's pudding, and though the plums are plentiful enough to bear much sampling, an earlier remark about space and time forbids us to continue. Doubtless Mr. Jaggard's bibliography might have been better if he had done various things differently; but only

pedantry will stint its recognition of the service which he has rendered to the study of Shakespeare.

A. W. P.

Tables Générales des Cinquante premières Années de la Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1859-1908. Par Charles Du Bus. Tome I. Table des Articles. Imp. 8vo, 172 pp. 1910.

It is indeed a worthy enterprise on the part of the publishers to endeavour to make available the vast amount of valuable material to be found in the long series of volumes of the 'Gazette des Beaux Arts,' and there can be nothing but praise for the industry and accuracy (as far as it has been tested) displayed in the compilation of the index named above. Besides gratitude, however, another feeling obtrudes itself on the mind of the librarian using the volume—namely, doubt whether the best means have been adopted for the end in view, quick, ready, and complete reference to any matter required.

It may be worth while to examine its structure more closely in order to find out where lies the weakness of this type of index. The bulk of the volume consists of a classified list of the articles which have appeared in the 'Gazette' down to 1908, the entries being numbered consecutively. The list is divided primarily into two sections—'art' and the 'arts'—and further divided into various sections, themselves subdivided chronologically and topographically. The classification

itself is adequate enough, but is necessarily not such as can be carried in the head—and there is no alphabetical index to it, only a synopsis of the headings. It follows that in tracking down an article, the subject only of which is known, it may be necessary to glance through the whole synopsis and try several possible headings before the right one is hit on.

The classified section is followed by no fewer than four separate alphabetical indexes: (1) of authors and writers (including titles of anonymous or collective publications); (2) of artists; (3) of places, towns, museums, sales, collections, collectors, patrons, and generally all names evoking the idea of the localization of works of art; (4) of subjects, titles of works, and matters not coming under the preceding categories. This last index does not include the subject headings of the various sections of the classified part, *e.g.* there is nothing under 'Architecture,' 'Ivoires.' It is a distinct loss of time and effort to have to think in which of these four indexes to look up a given name. For example, if one were trying to find an article on Molière's coat of arms, one might not turn at once to the first index, which is chiefly confined to writers of articles in the 'Gazette'; or for references to De Goncourt to the Topographical Index (No. 3).

The idea of an index in the form of a classified and numbered series of titles is a good one in itself, and it only needs the addition of a single, amplified name and subject index to become a handy bibliographical tool.

W. R. B. P.



THE LIBRARY

EDITED BY
J. W. NICHOLS
EST. 1855

OCTOBER
1901



J. & E. BUMPUS, LTD.

BOOKSELLERS BY APPOINTMENT TO H.M. THE KING

350 OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Special Department (Second Floor) for Old Books, First Editions of Popular Literature, Best Library Editions of Standard Works, etc.

Also (First Floor) for the Exhibition and Sale of Books in Standard and Popular Literature, Handsomely Bound in Morocco, Calf, etc., all executed by able and experienced workmen.

Bookbinding in all its branches.

Libraries Purchased, Catalogued and Arranged

MESSRS. ELLIS

Dealers in OLD and RARE BOOKS, MANUSCRIPTS and ENGRAVINGS
29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

(Business established by John Brindley in 1748)

LIBRARIES arranged and catalogued; large or small collections of old Books purchased; Rare Books and Prints searched for and reported; SALES BY AUCTION attended and commissions carefully executed; all descriptions of BOOK-BINDING and repairs to old books undertaken and carried out by the most skillful craftsmen; London Agents for the VELLUCENT Bindings of Messrs. Cecil Chivers, of Bath; Sole British Agents for the facsimile reproduction of the famous illuminated MS. the HORTULUS ANIMÆ, of Vienna; CATALOGUES of new purchases issued periodically; inspection of the stock invited.

Bradninch

Being a short Historical Sketch of the Honor, the Manor, the Borough and Liberties, and the Parish, by CHARLES CROFTON, D.D., Vicar of Bradninch, and Rural Dean, author of "The Constitutional History of the Church," etc. Crown 4to, printed on pure rag paper, with many illustrations, xvi. and 368 pp., 7/6 net.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, 32, GEORGE ST., MANCHESTER, W.

u
of
m
in
ad

old
ed
er
the
ish
the
ew





THE LIBRARY.

A QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

J. Y. W. MACALISTER and A. W. POLLARD.

Advisory Committee: JOHN BALLINGER, G. F. BARWICK, KONRAD BURGER,
MELVIL DEWEY, W. W. GREG, ROBERT STEELE, H. B. WHEATLEY,
J. DOVER WILSON, T. J. WISE.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CAMBRIDGE FRAGMENTS; by CHARLES SAYLE	339
'THE AUTOCRAT' AS BOOK-LOVER; by W. E. A. AXON	356
THE EARLY HUMANISTS OF ELSSASS; by S. H. SCOTT	363
AN OLD DUBLIN STATIONER'S WILL AND INVENTORY; by E. R. McC. DIX	379
THE CHURCH OF ST. MAGNUS AND THE BOOKSELLERS OF LONDON BRIDGE; by HENRY R. PLOMER	384
THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS; by J. H. HESSELS.	396
RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE; by ELIZABETH LEE	422
REVIEWS; by A. W. P.	432
INDEX	443

DUSTLESS LIBRARIES.

For the effective LAYING of DUST and DIRT,
not only during each sweeping, but throughout all the intervening
periods—which is of greater hygienic importance,
USE the unequalled ODOURLESS, or powerful GERMICIDAL

FLORIGENE

(A Regd. Name
suggested by
Floor-Hygiene)

On all Library, Museum, etc., Floors and Linoleums of every description.

"Florigene" is a great labour-saver, as each application lays the dust for two to twelve months, according to wear. No Scrubbing (unless preferred) or Sprinkling of any kind—the ordinary daily dry sweeping alone required.

"Florigene" is an aid to the Prevention of Throat and other Diseases, and has been awarded the BRONZE MEDAL of the ROYAL SANITARY INSTITUTE.

Two well-known Medical Officers have jointly reported on the advantages of "Florigene"—as the result of bacteriological experiments—as follows:

1. Economy of labour in cleaning the room.
2. Prevention of the raising of dust once deposited;
hence a healthier atmosphere for breathing.

They also favour its more general adoption.

Send for particulars, Medical Reports and Testimonials to the Sole Manufacturers—

THE "DUST-ALLAYER" CO.

165, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

CONTRACTORS to the ADMIRALTY, N.M. OFFICE of WORKS, WAR OFFICE, etc.

**IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION
TO LIBRARIANSHIP.**

LIBRACO LIMITED beg to announce the early publication of an important new work by Mr. James Duff Brown, Librarian of Islington, entitled

**MANUAL OF
LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION
AND CATALOGUING**

This work which is urgently needed in view of the fact that the text books on these two subjects are out-of print, has been prepared to cover every aspect of classification and cataloguing in the clear and concise manner which characterises the writings of the author. The theoretical, historical and practical sides of both subjects will be adequately dealt with, and a series of facsimile pages of all the world's great catalogues will render the book indispensable to everyone connected with libraries.

In addition to the code of rules for cataloguing which the author supplies, a complete digest of the Anglo-American International Code of Rules will be included by special permission of the Council of the Library Association.

The book will be well illustrated and will be provided with bibliographies and other appendices of value to students.

About 280 pp. 72 Facsimiles & Illustrations. Demy 8vo, Cloth.

7s. 6d. post free.

Orders should be sent at once to:—

LIBRACO LIMITED,

60, Wilson Street, Finsbury Square, E.C.

— OR —

95, Bridge Street, Deansgate, Manchester.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS

SECOND EDITION—REVISED

Burma: a Handbook of Practical, Commercial, Political Information

By Sir J. GEORGE SCOTT, K.C.I.E. ("Shway Yoe"), author of "The Burman: His Life and Notions." Special cover design, with many illustrations and map, appendices on the Shan States, and other subjects. Crown 8vo, cloth, 10/6 net.

"Unassuming in appearance, yet packed full of the most practically valuable material, Sir J. George Scott's Handbook must take at once an important place among works of reference dealing with the Indian Empire. . . . The volume is altogether thoroughly business-like and highly informing. Photographs form a valuable accessory, and the appendices contain much useful statistical and other material."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"The present work . . . is to be recommended . . . for the accuracy, completeness, and careful arrangement of its information, although there are flashes here and there of the power of graphic description that made the author's earlier works, under the pseudonym of "Shway Yoe," conspicuous."—*Athenaeum*.

Hypnotism: Its History, Practice, and Theory

By J. MILNE BRAMWELL, M.B., C.M. Demy 8vo, cloth 18/- net.

The chief aim of this monograph is to draw the attention of medical men to the therapeutic value of hypnotism. The author has devoted the last twelve years to hypnotic practice and research, and his personal observation of the practical work done in France, Germany, Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, and Belgium, should also make the volume a valuable addition to the science of a subject which is exciting much interest at the present time. The historical part of the book contains much important and little-known matter regarding the work of Elliotson, Esdaile, and Braid. The methods of inducing hypnosis are exhaustively dealt with, and full instructions are given as to the management of the hypnotic state, together with details regarding the causes which influence susceptibility to hypnosis. Many interesting hypnotic experiments are recorded, as well as numerous cases illustrative of surgical and medical uses of hypnotism. Hypnotic theories are outlined and discussed, and much attention is devoted to the question of the existence of a subliminal or secondary consciousness.

ALEXANDER MORING LTD., 32 GEORGE ST., HANOVER SQ., W.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE
ENGLISH GOETHE SOCIETY

NO. XI.

Goethe in England & America

Bibliography by EUGENE OSWALD, M.A., Ph.D., secretary
to the Society. Second Edition, revised and enlarged by
L. and E. Oswald. Demy 8vo, wrapped, vi. and
75 pp., 5/- net.

NO. XII.

Schillers Freundschaft mit
Goethe

Vortrag gehalten in der „English Goethe Society“ zur
Feier von Schillers 150. Geburtstage, von H. G. FIEDLER,
Taylorian Professor der deutschen Sprache und Literatur
an der Universität Oxford. Demy 8vo, 2/6 net.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, 32 GEORGE ST., HANOVER SQ., W.

DELICIOUS COFFEE.

**RED
WHITE
& BLUE**

For Breakfast & after Dinner.

PURE HIGHLAND MALT

**PEATMOOR
WHISKY.**

GUARANTEED 12 YEARS OLD

Wholesale :

HANSON'S, London, Eng.

r
R
D
g.

II.

Z



Pattern used for a Beam Paper at Christ's College, Cambridge,
probably in or soon after 1509.